NOT TO BE TAKEN
FROM THE LIBRARY

J. M. Shaw

upstairs
378.744
BO
A.M. 1929
sh cl.

Boston University
College of Liberal Arts
Library

THE GIFT OF the Author

upstairs
378.744
BO
A.M. 1929
sh
cl.

Ideal
Double Reversible
Manuscript Cover
PATENTED NOV. 15, 1898
Manufactured by
Adams, Cushing & Foster

28-6½

p5969

Boston University

Graduate School

Thesis

The Legalism of St. Paul

Submitted by

John Manley Shaw

(A. B., DePauw University, 1926)

In partial fulfilment of requirements for

the degree of Master of Arts

1929

Jn.

Ser.

p5969

Upstairs
378.744
BO
A.M.1929
sh
c.1

Outline of Thesis

I Foreword - page 1-2

A. Present criticism of Paul - - - - - - - - - -- " 1

B. Problems of today

C. Method of Discussion - - - - - - - - - - - - " 2

II The sources of our knowledge of Paul - - - - - " 3

A. Types of sources

1. Autobiography, letters

2. Biography

3. History and tradition

B. Analysis of sources for authorship - - - - " 3

1. Acts of the Apostles - - - - - - - - - - " 3

2. Romans - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - " 5

3. First Corinthians - - - - - - - - - - -- " 6

4. Second Corinthians - - - - - - - - - - - " 7

5. Galations - - - - -- - - - - - - - - - " 8

6. Ephesians - - - - -- - - - - - - - - - " 9

7. Philippians - - - - - - - - - - - - - -- " 11

8. Colossians -- - - - - - - - - - - - - -- " 12

9. First Thessalonians - - - - - - - - - -- " 14

10. Second Thessalonians -- - - - - - - - -- " 15

11. Pastoral Epistles - - - - - - - - - - -- " 16

III Paul's training and early life - - - - - - - - " 18-24

A. Home and parentage - - - - - - - - - - - - - " 18

1. Mother

2. Father

3. Home influence - - - - - - - - - - - - - " 19

B. Training at Jerusalem - - - - - - - - - - - page 20

1. Legalistic training

2. Legal religion - - -- - - - - - - - - - " 21

3. Pharisaic doctrine -- - - - - - - - - - " 22

IV Legalism in Paul's theology - - - - - - - - - - " 25-37

A. Paul's conversion - - - - - - - - - - - - - - " 25

1. Bauer and Strauss

2. Pfleiderer

3. Psychological explanation

a, Testimonies about Jesus - - - - - " 26

b, Breakdown of the law

4. Paul adds faith in Christ as the Messiah to his legal religion - - - - - - - -- " 27

5. Paul retains his legalism

a, Law of Moses

b, Legalistic interpretation of Messiah 28

c, Legalism in his personal life - - " 29

d, Legalism in his theology - - -- - " 30

B. Pauline theology - - - - - - - - - - - - - -- " 31

1. God and the World

a, Righteousness of God vs loving Father 32

b, Anger of God

2. Man and Sin - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - " 33

a, All flesh is sinful

b, Law reveals sin - - - - - - - - - - " 34

c, Debt to God is too great for man to pay - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - " 34

3. Christ and Redemption

a, Fore-knowledge - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - page 35

b, Fore-ordination

c, "Calling"

d, Justification

e, Sanctification - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - " 36

V Paul's value for modern thought - - - - - - - - - - - - " 38-55

A. Recapitulation -- " 38

B. Era of revolution - seeking freedom

1. Crime wave - seeking freedom - - - - - - - - -- " 40

2. Political revolution

3. Freedom of Woman - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - " 41

4. Revolution in the Arts and Letters - - - - -- - " 41

5. Moral revolt - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -- - " 43

6. Revolt in Religion - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -- - " 44

C. Problem of rëinterpreting Christianity

1. Paul's problem

2. Our problem

3. Principle of freedom similar to both - - - -- " 45

D. Paul's interpretation of freedom - - - - - -- - - - " 46

1. Freedom through law not from law - - - - - - -- " 47

2. Freedom is not license - - - - - - - - - - - - -- " 48

3. Spiritual love is the interpretation of law - " 49

E. Freedom today must be spiritual freedom

1. Relation of religion to spirituality - - - -- " 53

2. Spiritual life through faith in Christ Jesus - " 54

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2017 with funding from
Boston Library Consortium Member Libraries

https://archive.org/details/thelegalismofstp00shaw

Paul's Emancipation from Legalism

Foreword

The problem of Jesus or Paul has caused a great deal of comment. On the continent William Werde in his "Paulus" set the problem going, and it has been taken up by many men such as J. Weiss, W. Bousset, Kaftan, and others. In this country also the problem has received much attention. This has been done too often in the light of destructive criticism. Men have tried to give the cry "Back to Jesus" in place of the cry of the seventeenth century "Back to the Apostles". This has been a fine emphasis upon the purifying of Christianity, but it has not always given Paul the rightful place he should have. He has been underrated by many because they have not understood his primary emphasis of freedom to be gained through a spiritual power. I would not deny their scholarship but I would note that their emphasis has created a psychological barrier falsifying their estimate of Paul.

There has been in the last fifty years much conflict between science and religion. This conflict has given rise to the problem of modernism and fundamentalism. The problem today is the transplanting of religion to scientific mind and retaining the best of both. The problem faced by Paul was similar, transplanting religion into the philosophic mind. The problem is the same only the content is changed.

Amal's Emancipation from Legalism

Foreword

The problem of Amal or Amal has caused a great deal of comment. On the continent William Marris in his "Amalus" set the problem going, and it has been taken up by many men such as J. Yates, E. Gossett, Harlan, and others. In this country also the problem has received much attention. This has been done too often in the light of destructive criticism. Mr. Harris tried to give the cry "back to Amalus" in place of the cry of the seventeenth century "back to the Apostles". This has been a fine emphasis upon the purity of Christianity, but it has not always given Amal the rightful place he should have. We have been concerned by many theories that have not understood his primary emphasis of Christ on to be guided through a spiritual power. I would not deny their sincerity but I would note that their emphasis has created a psychological bar for realizing their ideals of Amal.

There has been in the last fifty years much conflict between science and religion. This conflict has given rise to the problem of modernism and fundamentalism. The problem today is the transplanting of religion to scientific mind and retaining the best of both. The problem faced by Amal was similar, transplanting religion into the philosophic mind. The problem is the same only the content is changed.

Contrary to the statements of some scholars with whom I have talked, I believe that Paul has a very marked place in the life of today, that his aid to Christianity was of infinite worth and that his Christianity did not leave out the Christ by supplanting him with legalistic doctrine.

In my attempt to show this I wish to use four steps: first, to discuss the sources of our knowledge of Paul; second, to study Paul's training and to bear special emphasis upon its legalistic side; third, to study his major doctrine and analyze his theology; fourth, to point out the problem he faced and his method of solution. Then I wish to apply it to modern times and show how his emphasis is the method that must be used today in our dealing with the problem of modernism and fundamentalism.

I.

The Sources of our knowledge of Paul

In studying about any ancient character there are perhaps three types of sources. The best and most valuable source is the writings of the man himself,- letters, addresses, autobiography, or books. The second best source is the writings of a friend or companion,- a biography or memoirs. The third source is historical and traditional records; these, of course, are the least reliable. In regard to St. Paul we are very fortunate in having all three types of sources. First, we have a number of letters written by his own hand telling of his life and his doctrine. Second, we have the book of Acts, of which a part at least was written by a companion of his. Third, we have the Apostolic Fathers who, although they did not know Paul, yet knew of him and mentioned him in their works. These various sources are found, first in the New Testament, second in the early histories of the times as narrated by historians, and also in the writings of the Apostolic Fathers - Irenaeus, Justin Martyr, Ignatius, Polycarp, and Clement of Rome.

In a discussion of the reliability of the sources it is most convenient to follow the order of the New Testament.

The book of Acts gives the life of Paul and is our first source. This book assumes to come from the same hand as the third Gospel as is shown by the preface. "The former treatice I made, O Theophilus, concerning all that Jesus began both to

I.

The Sources of our Knowledge of Paul

In studying about any ancient character there are particular three types of sources. The best and most valuable source is the writings of the man himself - letters, autobiography, or books. The second best source is the writings of a friend or companion, - a biography or memoirs. The third source is historical and traditional records; these, of course, are the least reliable. In regard to St. Paul we are very fortunate in having all three types of sources. First, we have a number of letters written by his own hand telling of his life and his doctrine. Second, we have the book of Acts, of which a part at least was written by a companion of his. Third, we have the apostolic fathers who, although they did not know Paul, yet knew of his and mentioned him in their works. These various sources are found, first in the New Testament, second in the early ecclesiastical writers as narrated by historians, and also in the writings of the apostolic fathers - Irenaeus, Justin Martyr, Ignatius, Polycarp, and Clement of Rome.

In a discussion of the reliability of the sources it is most convenient to follow the order of the New Testament.

The book of Acts gives the life of Paul and is our first source. This book seems to come from the same hand as the third Gospel as is shown by the preface. "The former treatise I made, O Theophilus, concerning all that Jesus began both to

do and to teach." (Acts 1 [1]) In Luke 1[3] we find the first treatise. It is written to Theophilus and it answers the description of "the former treatise concerning all that Jesus began both to do and to teach". Also the style of the two books is similar in vocabulary, method of diction, and beauty of expression. The uniform tradition dated from Irenaeus also ascribes this work, as well as the gospel, to Luke.

In a study of the internal evidence of authorship the starting point is found in the "We-sections". Here the author uses the first person plural in referring to Paul and himself. We would gather that he was a traveling companion of Paul on part of his journeys. In contradiction to this belief the hypothesis was presented that the book was a composite document and that another hand had taken these "We-sections" and reëdited the entire book in its present form. Such names as Timothy, Silas, and Titus have been offered as the final editors. This hypothesis has been weakened because of the difficulty in separating the "We-sections" from the remainder of the book. A writer of such skill would never have used a source bodily without changing the person of the verb unless he himself had originally been present. The second point that has weakened the hypothesis of compilation is the unity between the "We-sections" and the remainder of the book. The literary style does not break when the "We-sections" begin, as has been pointed out by Harnack and Hawkins. The unity of style can hardly be explained by the author's revision since he left the person of the verb unchanged, and

also there are cross references with other parts of the book. "Thus in 21[8] we have a reference to the fact that Philip was one of the seven and who the seven were has been explained in Ch. 6 where it is also mentioned that Philip was one of them." [1] Thus it seems almost certain, and in this we are in harmony with the majority of New Testament scholars, that the book of Acts is from the pen of one who was well educated as shown from his linguistic style, and who was a friend and traveling companion of Paul. Thus the book of Acts is a source of reliable information concerning the life and teaching of Paul. It gains in reliability because the author was educated and so could more clearly understand and rightly interpret the material he wrote. He would not be writing things he did not understand and his impressions would be more trustworthy than if he were an ignorant though zealous Christian.

The next source that we will analyze as to authorship and reliability is the Epistle of Paul to the Romans. The authorship of this letter is certain and it is attested in numerous ways. In the salutation of the letter Paul says that he is writing to the beloved of God in Rome. The first person singular is used continually throughout the letter and there is no occasion to question the letter on the grounds of compilation since the same flowing style and diction is constant throughout. There is good evidence to believe that the author of I Peter used this letter, and perhaps the author of James and Hebrews did likewise.

(1) Intro. to N. T. Bacon P. 126

also there are direct references with other parts of the text. Thus in 61[8] we have a reference to the last text, telling us one of the seven and who the seven were has been explained in 58, where it is also mentioned that Matilp was one of them.[9] Thus it seems almost certain, one is led to see in harmony with the majority of new Egyptian scholars, that the book of Ani is from the pen of one who was well acquainted as shown from his literary style, and who was a keen and travelling companion of Ani. Thus the book of Ani is a source of reliable information concerning the life and teaching of Ani. It gives us reliability, concerning the author intended and so could more clearly under and rightly interpret the material he wrote. He would not be writing things he did not understand and his impressions would be more trustworthy than if he were a ignorant through serious tribulation.

The most source that we will employ as to authenticity and reliability is the papyrus of Ani in the Vatican. The authenticity of this letter is certain and it is attested in numerous ways. In the minuteness of the letter Ani says that he is writing to the colors of .ai in Amen. The first person singular is used continually throughout the letter and there is no occasion to question the letter on the grounds of composition since the same flowing style and diction is constant throughout. There is good evidence to believe that the author of Ani wrote this letter, and perhaps the author of Amen and Ptahwa did likewise.

(1) Budge, op. c. Pages 1-143

As for external criticism we find Clement of Rome, Ignatius, and Polycarp knew of and used this letter; it was part of the Canon of Marcion. Thus there is no reason for doubting that Paul was the author of this letter and therefore it is one of the most reliable types of sources we could desire.

The second letter to be studied is "The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians". This letter, also, is ascribed to Paul in the salutation and the first person singular is used continually. In the conclusion of the letter Paul sends his greetings and writes it in his own hand. In accepting the genuineness of this epistle we are following the lead of the Tubingen School and practically all other scholars. There are a few who doubt the genuineness of this letter and of all the other Pauline letters. These scholars who doubt the authorship are Dutch: Loman, Steck, Pierson, Naber, Van Manen, and also Bruno Bauer, a free lance of the Tubingen School. These men have endeavored by a subjective criticism to dissolve the personality of Paul (and of Jesus) into the product of vague and arbitrarily-assumed movements of Jewish religious thought. A careful account of the arguments of the Dutch hypercritical School, and of Steck, is given by Knowling, the "Witness of the Epistles" ch. 111, cf. also Schmiedel and Hand. Kommentar Vol. II; Zahl, "die Briefe des Paulus seit 50 Jahren in Feuer der Kritch".(2) These scholars have been answered by Gloel and Leudermann. These men seem to have the inability to appreciate the strength of individual personality and to distinguish the spontaneous from the artificial, as pointed out by A. Robert-

(2) See H.B.D. footnote P. 484

As for extant critiques we find Gleason of Acre, Ignatius, and Eligeor, Amer of Ain Qeel this letter; it was part of the canon of Gregorios. Then there is no reason to doubt that it was the author of the letter and therefore it is one of the most reliable types of sources we could receive.

The second letter to be studied is the first epistle of John to the Corinthians. This letter, also, is ascribed to John in the salutation and the first person singular is used continually. In the conclusion of the letter John asks his correspondents and writes it in his own hand. In accepting the genuineness of this epistle we are following the lead of the Antiochian school and practically all other scholars. There are a few who doubt the genuineness of this letter and of all the other Jonline letters. These scholars who doubt the authenticity are Dutch: Loman, Abbes, Hilgers, Lopes, van Manen, and also Yemo Lamer, a free thinker of the Dutch school. These men have supported by a subjective criticism to disprove the personality of Paul (and of Jesus) in the process of verse and rationality-assumed movements of Jewish religious thought. - Grafuel was not of the Dutch of the Dutch Apostolical school, and of Jesus, is lion by Jesus. The "witness of the Spirit" d. 1.1. 2. also Schmiedel and Hand. Lamer 3d. 1.1; Lect. 1.1. Jesus was again sent to Jerusalem in order for "Christ."

These scholars have been answered by Abel and Lemarchand. Since man seems to have the inability to appreciate the strength or individual personality and to distinguish the genuineness from the artificial, as points out by J. Schmiedel (1) Jesus S.O. Jesus's. Jesus

son in Hastings Bible Dictionary. (3) The evidence both internal and external, in spite of the objections of the Dutch School, leads us to accept this epistle as a genuine work of St. Paul, and therefore a source of the highest order.

The companion letter to the one just discussed is "The Second Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians". The authorship of this letter has had more severe criticism and is not so well attested by external evidence. Clement of Rome does not mention it at all, but its content is such as to have called forth mention in his letter from Rome to Corinth had he known of it. Thus we must conclude that he did not know of this letter. Ignatius does not use it. It was probably known by Polycarp (4) and placed by Marcion in his Canon. Irenaeus mentions it as belonging to Paul and it is included in the Muratorian Canon. As for internal evidence it seems quite genuine. Paul says in the salutation that he is author and throughout the letter he says "Now I Paul myself". (10[1]) In showing the internal evidence Peake says "The complexity of relations between Paul and the Corinthian Church, the note of reality which rings in every sentence, the mighty personality which the letter reveals, are far beyond the reach of the most skillful imitator. Besides we could not understand why so much labor should be expended to create an intricate historical situation which could serve no purpose a later writer would have had in view, and be completely without interest for second-century readers." (5) Although the

(3) H.B.D. P. 484 - footnote
(4) II Cor. 4:14 quoted in Polycarp Ad Phil II
(5) Peake Intro. to N. T. p. 32f

con in Gentile's Philopletonomy. (3) The evidence both internal and external, in spite of the objections of the Dutch School, leaves us to accept this epistle as a genuine work of it. Paul, and therefore a source of the eighth order.

The companion letter to the one just discussed is the second epistle of Paul to the Corinthians. The authenticity of this letter has had more severe criticism and is not so well attested by external evidence. Clement of Rome does not mention it at all, but its content is such as to have called forth mention in his letter from some to which had be known of it. Thus we must conclude that he did not know of this letter. Ignatius does not use it. It was probably known by Polycarp (4) and placed by Marcion in his canon. Irenaeus mentions it as belonging to Paul and it is included in the Muratorian canon. As for internal evidence it seems quite genuine. Paul says in the salutation that he is author and throughout the letter he says "on a Paul speaks." Lic(5) in showing the internal evidence Peake says "the complexity of relations between Paul and the Corinthian church, the note of reality which rings in every sentence, the mighty personality which the letter reveals, are far beyond the reach of the most skillful imitator. Besides we could not understand why so such letter should be contrived to create an imaginary historical situation which could serve no purpose a later writer could have had in view, and be completely without interest for second-century readers." (6) Although the

(3) D.E.C. p. 494-[illegible]
(4) II Cor. 4:14 quoted in Polycarp ad Phil II
(5) Peake Intro. to N. T. p. 302

Dutch scholars deny the Pauline authorship, yet, as A.Robertson says, all "sober criticism" accept its genuineness and so we shall be sober in this day of Prohibition and accept Paul's authorship for "The Second Epistle to the Corinthians".

The letter to the Galatians is also one of the major letters of Paul that has not been questioned very seriously as to authorship. The Dutch School has been mentioned and it has been stated how their objections have been overruled by the majority of modern scholars. As for external criticism: "In the early part of the second century it formed a part of Marcion's Apostolicon. A little later it was included in the Syriac and Old Latin VSS, and was recognized by the Muratorian Canon. It is cited as the work of St. Paul by Irenaeus (III, VI. 5; III. XVI. 3; V. XXI. 1), by Clement of Alexandria (Strom. III. 16); and it is quoted by Justin Martyr (Dial. C. 95; Aratio, 5) and by Athenagoras (Legato C. 16)" (6) These may also be referred to by Clement, Barnabas, Ignatius, and Hermas, but as Dodd says these are "somewhat dull and doubtful".

The internal evidence is very strong indeed. Paul's name is given in the salutation. He speaks of himself by name and by the use of the first person singular throughout the letter, and the diction and language of which shows the same dynamic style. Although there are minor discrepancies of thought as in the number of years spent between the conversion and going to Jerusalem, (Gal. 2 & Acts 9[23]) yet

(6) Marcus Dodd H. B. D.

Dutch scholars deny the Italian authorship, yet, as a Roberts-
son says, all "Dodor criticism" accept the genuineness and
so we shall be sober in this way of irpolitition and accept
Paul's authorship for "the second epistle to the Corinthians".

The letter to the Galatians is also one of the major
letters of Paul that has not been questioned very seriously
as to authorship. The Dutch school has been mentioned and
it has been stated how their objections have been overruled
by the majority of modern scholars. As for external evid-
ence: "In the early part of the second century it formed
a part of Marcion's apostolicon. A little later it was in-
cluded in the syriac and Old Latin Vss, and was recognized
by the Muratorian Canon. It is cited as the work of St. Paul
by Irenaeus (III, VI. 5; III. XVI. 8, V. XXI. 1), by Clement
of Alexandria (strom. III. 16); and it is quoted by Justin
Martyr (Dial. C. 35; Apolo, 5) and by Athenagoras (legato
C. 16)" (6) These may also be referred to by Clement, Jerome,
Origen, Ignatius, and Hermas, but as Todd says these are "some-
what dull and doubtful".

The internal evidence is very strong indeed. Paul's
name is given in the salutation. He speaks of himself by
name and by the use of the first person singular throug-
out the letter, and the diction and language of which shows
the same dynamic style. Although there are minor diserepan-
cies of thought as in the number of years spent between the
conversion and going to Jerusalem, (Gal. 2 & Acts 9 [illegible]) yet

(6) Marcus Dods H. R. D.

they do not mar the belief in the genuineness of authorship. Here again we will follow modern scholars in accepting Paul's authorship of this letter.

Paul's letter to the Ephesians has not been accepted as readily as a genuine Pauline epistle. It has been attested by external criticism. Peake[5] points out that it was probably used by Ignatius, and Polycarp, and by the author of the "Shepherd of Hermas", thus showing that it was known in the early years of the second century. It was included in the Marcion collection and also mentioned in the Muratorian Canon. Irenaeus quotes it as belonging to Paul as also do later writers. Peake believes that it was used by the Apostle Peter in I Peter, and if so he would accept its genuineness.

The internal evidence is not so convincing in many ways. Paul worked in Ephesus for three years and in 3^{2-4} he speaks as if their knowledge of his ministry was by hearsay only. In 1^{15} he speaks as if he only knew of their faith from the testimony of others. Paul does not give any personal greetings and the only explanation is that if he is the author he did not know anyone. Thus the objections are stated. There are two methods of solution:- first, the letter was not written by Paul but by another; second, the letter was written by Paul but not to Ephesus. In objecting to the first method of solution, and not touching on the above objections, we are able to note the close similarity of this epistle to the regular Pauline style. There are many close similarities between this letter and that to the Colossians, for instance:

(5) Peake Intro. to N. T. p. 32f

Col.	Eph.	Col.	Eph.
1: 1-2	1: 1-2	1: 25	3: 2
1: 3	1: 15	2: 13-14	2: 1
1: 9	1: 16	2: 19	4: 15-16
1: 10	4: 1	3: 1	1: 20
1: 13b	1: 6b	3: 3	2: 6
1: 26	3: 5	3: 5	4: 19
1: 27	1: 9	3: 7b	2: 2-3, 4: 22, 4: 25b, 4: 24
1: 28	4: 13	3: 12-13	4: 2, 4: 32
2: 2-6	4: 16-20	3: 14-15	4: 3-4
2: 7	2: 22	3: 16-17	1: 8, 5: 19-20
2: 9	3: 19	3: 18-19	5: 22b, 5: 25b
2: 10	1: 21-23	3: 20	6: 1
2: 11	2: 11	3: 21	6: 4
2: 12	2: 19-20	3: 22-25	6: 5-8
1: 18-19	1: 22-23	4: 1	6: 9
1: 20	1: 10	4: 2-4	6: 18-20
1: 21	2: 1	4: 5-6	5: 15-16
1: 22	2: 15-16	4: 7-8	6: 21-22
1: 24	3: 1		

If now Colossians is a Pauline letter as most scholars accept it, then this argument for style and content is very strong indeed. It would seem from this that Ephesians is a Pauline letter if the arguments mentioned above as to his unfamiliarity to the church could be answered.

The second method of solution offered was that the letter was not written to the church at Ephesis. (7) This problem centers about ἐν Ἐφέσῳ (1[1]). Many early copies in the second century lacked these words as Origin and Basel remark. The two best manuscripts ℵ and B omit these words. Marcion (7) did not use them and Tertullian charges him with falsifying the title. If Tertullian had read ἐν Ἐφέσῳ he would have used that as his basic argument, but he does not do this. He refers to tradition. In accepting the omission of ἐν Ἐφέσῳ the question arises as to whom the letter was addressed. The hypothesis of a circular letter answers very well; the letter was sent to many churches including Ephesus, and the original title read

Gal.	Gal.	Gal.	Gal.
1: 1-2	1: 1-2	1: 14	2: 1
1: 2	1: 16	2: 15-14	2: 1
1: 3	1: 16	3: 19	4: 15-16
1: 10	4: 1	3: 1	1: 20
1: 15	1: 6b	3: 2	2: 6
1: 16	2: 6	3: 3	4: 18
1: 17	1: 3	3: 7b	1: 1-2, 4: 22, 4: 24, 4: 24
1: 18	4: 13	3: 13-12	4: 2, 4: 22
1: 1-5	4: 15-20	3: 14-15	4: 1-4
1: 7	1: 22	3: 15-17	1: 2, 2: 15-20
1: 9	2: 19	3: 18-19	2: 22b, 2: 22b
1: 10	1: 21-23	3: 20	2: 1
1: 11	2: 11	: 21	2: 4
1: 12	2: 19-20	3: 22-23	2: 2-3
1: 18-19	1: 22-23	4: 1	2: 3
1: 20	1: 10	4: 4	2: 15-20
1: 21	2: 1	4: 2-3	2: 15-16
1: 12	2: 15-16	4: 7-8	2: 21-22
1: 22	2: 1		

If now Colossians is a genuine letter as most scholars accept it, then this argument for style and content is very strong indeed. It would seem from this that Colossians is a genuine letter if the arguments mentioned above, as to its unfamiliarity to the church could be answered.

The second method of solution offered was that the letter was not written to the church at Colossae. (V) This problem centers about $\Upsilon\epsilon\nu\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu o\nu$ (1). Many early origins in the second century looked these words as origin and Semi remark. The two best manuscripts $\aleph$ and Γ omit these words. Lerolon (V) did not see them and Ferrillion charges him with falsifying the title. If Ferrillion had read $\Upsilon\epsilon\nu\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu o\nu$ he would have seen that as his main argument, but he does not do this. He refers to tradition. In accepting the omission of $\Upsilon\epsilon\nu\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu o\nu$ the question arises as to whom the letter was addressed. The hypothesis of a circular letter answers very well; the letter was sent to many churches including Colossae, and the original title read

"to those who are beloved and believing". Thus we draw our conclusion that this is a genuine Pauline epistle.

The letter of Paul to the Philippians has been questioned as to authorship upon four counts: first, alleged traces of imitation; second, ecclesiastical anachronism; third, gnostic controversies; and fourth, doctrinal discrepancies with Galatians, Corinthians, and Romans. Dr. Moffatt does not feel that the first objection is valid. The style and vocabulary as well as the general traits are quite Pauline. There is also no good argument to defend a pseudonymous letter. In the second place we must admit the strangeness of 1^{1} "bishops and deacons". The use of these two terms is absent elsewhere although they are mentioned in Romans 13^{7}. In Romans they refer to gifts received by Paul, and these gifts from churches would be sent under the name of the officials. Schmiedel, Bruchner, and Völter regard these as later insertions by a second-century editor. This method of dealing with this specific problem is not very conclusive in itself, but it does offer an explanation which is readily accepted if the two words become the only objections to Pauline authorship.

In the third place the reference to gnostic teachings in 2^{5-8} is an advance over the other letters. The Christology here is more developed than in Paul's four great letters. This does not need to trouble us for development of Christology in a mind so virile and active as Paul's is to be expected. The Christology here is not in conflict with other letters. It is, no doubt, Paul's refutation not of the valentinian gnosis as Bauer imagined, but of earlier religious speculations upon a preexistent original Being in heaven.

"to those who are beloved and believing". Thus we draw our conclusion that this is a genuine Pauline epistle.

The letter of Paul to the Philippians has been questioned as to authorship upon four counts: first, alleged traces of imitation; second, ecclesiastical anachronism; third, gnostic controversies; and fourth, doctrinal discrepancies with Colossians, Corinthians, and Romans. Dr. Moffatt does not feel that the first objection is valid. The style and vocabulary as well as the general traits are quite Pauline. There is also no good argument to detend a pseudonymous letter. In the second place we must admit the strangeness of I "bishops and deacons". The use of these two terms is absent elsewhere although they are mentioned in Romans 13[7]. In Romans they refer to gifts received by Paul, and these gifts from churches would be sent under the name of the officials, commended, churches, and Voïter regard these as later insertions by a second-century editor. This method of dealing with this specific problem is not very convincing in itself, but it does offer an explanation which is readily accepted if the two words became the only objections to Pauline authorship.

In the third place the reference to gnostic teachings in 2-8 is an advance over the other letters. The christology here is more developed than in Paul's four great letters. This does not need to trouble us for development of Christology in a mind so virile and active as Paul's is to be expected. The christology here is not in conflict with other letters. It is, no doubt, Paul's reflection not of the Valentinian gnosis as Baur imagined, but of earlier religious speculations upon a preexistent original being in heaven.

The last objection was raised on the Christology and the conclusion of this is given above, but one word should be added. Their objection centers about 2^{5b} as Unpauline because it is inconsistent with Romans 8^{3}. Pfleiderer omits 2^{6-7} as a later interpolation. To me this does not seem necessary. In Romans 8^{3} Jesus is the preëxistent Son of God; in Philippians 2^{6} He existed in the form of God. In Philippians we have the further development of Christ by personal endeavor. This is more in accord with our present idea of psychological development and would naturally come to Paul in his study of the unfolding of the person of Christ. Surely the Christ of Mark 1^{9} is not the same as the Christ of Mark 14^{61-62}. There has been a real development here, and there is no reason why Paul should not have noted the development.

Thus we draw our conclusion that this letter is also one of those written by St. Paul and as such is one of our valuable sources as to Paul's doctrine and development. It also shows us that we must be exceedingly careful as to material, for later interpolations may have given a different color to the doctrine.

The next source for the discussion is that of "The Epistle of Paul to the Colossians". As for external criticism we note that it is included in the Canon of Marcion and it is also found in the Muratorian Canon. Irenaeus also definitely mentions it. There is a possibility that Justin Martyr, and Theophilus, and perhaps a few of the Apostolic Fathers used it. Thus we note there is valid ground in ex-

The last question was further on the dogmatic and the association of this is given above, but one more should be added. Their objection centers about C^{2} as Gospelline teaches it is inconsistent with Jesus B^{1}. Schlatter quotes A^{1-7} as a later inter polation. So we find does not seem necessary. In Jesus B^{2} Jesus is the presentient son of God; in Philippians C^{2} he exists in the form of God. In Philippians we find the original development of christ up particularly however. This is more in accord with our present idea of psychological development and could naturally come in small in the study of the unfolding of the person of Christ. Likewise the object of Mark 1^{2} is not the same as the object of Mark 14^{61-62}. There has been a great development here, and there is no reason why Paul should not have noted the development.

Thus we view our conclusion that this letter is also one of those written by St. Paul and as such is one of our valuable sources as to Paul's doctrine and development. It also shows us that we must be exceedingly careful as to material for later interpolations may have given a different color to the doctrine.

The next course for the discussion is that of the relation of Paul to the Colossians. As far external evidence is concerned it is included in the canon of Marcion and it is also found in the Muratorian canon. Irenaeus also definitely mentions it. There is a possibility that Justin Martyr, and Theophilus, may perhaps a few of the possible phrases used it. Thus we note there is very strong in ex-

ternal criticism for the genuineness of the Pauline authorship.

The authorship of this letter was doubted, however, by the Tubingen School and also by many other scholars. It is still doubted by Schmiedel. Their objections lie in the internal criticism. The difficulty centers about two points:- first, the letter presents too rigid a view of Paul's mind; (this objection is based upon the material found in Corinthians, Galatians, and Roman letters) second, the letter also presupposes the completed gnostic systems of the second century. The external criticism shows that the letter was known early and that tends to detract from this second objection although it does not answer it entirely. Dr. Moffatt points out (8) that Oriental gnosticism and the later phases of Jewish speculations (9) had reached a more or less developed form at an earlier date. In some of its phases it had reached this form before the rise of Christianity. The rigidity of the letter as far as style and diction are concerned can hardly be questioned for it agrees very favorably with other letters, especially so when we remember that the church was not known personally by Paul. We find criticism of the Christology of Paul expressed by critics. They argue that the person of Christ formerly viewed by Paul as Redeemer now is presented as transcendental to the universe. Yet this argument is weak, I believe, for the same doctrine is found in I Cor. 8^{6} and 15^{24-28}.

(8) Intro. to N.T. page 153
(9) This Jewish speculation was developed quite fully in the Diaspora with Centers in Antioch and Ephesus.

trusal criticism for the punishments of the writing author-
ship.

The authorship of this letter was random, however, by
the Tangyan school and also by many other scholars. It is
still counted by scholars. Their conjectures lie in the in-
ternal criticism. The difficulty centers about two points:-
first, the letter presents too rigid a view of Jesus's mind;
(this criticism is based upon the material found in Gosp-
ums, Matthew, and Lukan letters) second, the letter also
presupposes the developed gnostic systems of the second cen-
tury. The external criticism shows that the letter was known
early and that tends to detract from this strong conjecture bi-
cause it does not answer it directly. Dr. Moffatt points out
(8) that original Christian and the later phases of Jewish
speculations (9) had reached a more or less developed form at
an earlier date. In some of the phases it had reached this
form before the rise of Christianity. The rigidity of the
letter so far as style is concerned can hardly be
questioned for it agrees very favorably with other letters.
Essentially, then we conclude that the church was not known
personally by Paul. The first criticism of the Christology of
Paul expressed by critics. They argue that the person of Christ
formally viewed by Paul as Redeemer now is presented as Uni-
versal to the universe. Let this argument is weak. I be-
lieve, for the same doctrine is found in 1 Cor. 8:6 and 15:1-28.

(8) Moffat, to N.T. page 143
(9) Gnostic Jewish speculation was developed quite fully in the
philosophy with centers in Antioch and Alexandria.

I would not argue that the two are harmonious with the Christ-the-Redeemer conception, but that the two conceptions are contained in authentic letters. The two ideas are there. We have found discrepancies in his theology before, and now I raise a question to be dealt with later: Is the theology central or is it only incidental and trying to free men's minds from bondage to old ideas so that they may be open to the reception of new ideas? The methods of opening men's minds may be opposite but the aim is the central thing. The objections listed above are well answered, in my estimate, by modern scholars and therefore we will accept the authenticity of this letter.

First Thessalonians is the next letter in our Canon and it has not been questioned except by the most radical critics. The external evidence is good. Irenaeus mentions it, as do the writers from his time on. It is included in the Muratorian Canon and also in the Canon of Christian Writings by Marcion. The internal evidence is very strong; in style, language, choice of words, and in theology we here recognize Paul. Those who do not reject it argue on the similarity to I & II Corinthians saying that it is just a copy and echo of the other epistles by another than Paul. The reading of the letter refutes this for most scholars. The second objection arises in the discrepancies between the Acts' account of the church and that found in Thessalonians. This objection becomes invalid when we realize the quickness of events in life. Death comes all too quickly and Christians could die without the Parousia in a few weeks after Paul's departure. Thus a slight turn of the kaleidoscope of time and the picture would be different. This readily explains the slight discrepancies found in the two

I would not argue that the two are harmonious with the Christ-
ian-Platonic conception, but that the two conceptions are con-
tained in authentic letters. The two ideas are there. We
have found discrepancies in his theology before, and now I
raise a question to be dealt with later: Is the theology
true or is it only incidental and trying to keep man's mind
from bondage to old ideas so that they may be open to the
reception of new ideas? The methods of opening man's minds may
be opposite but the aim is the central thing. The objections
listed above are well answered in my estimate by modern scholars
and therefore we will accept the authenticity of this letter.

First Corinthians is the most letter in our canon and
it has not been questioned except by the most radical critics.
The external evidence is good. Irenaeus mentions it, as do
the writers from his time on. It is included in the Muratorian
Canon and also in the canon of Marcion which is Marcion.
The internal evidence is very strong; in style, language, or the
of works, and in theology we here recognize Paul. Those who
do not reject it argue on the similarity to II Corinthians
saying that it is just a copy and some of the other epistles
by another than Paul. The coming of the letter raises this
for most scholars. The second objection arises in the discrep-
ancies between the Acts' account of the church and that found
in Corinthians. This objection becomes invalid when we
realize the wildness of events in life. Truth comes all too
quickly and Christians could die without the rewards in a
few months after Paul's departure. Thus a slight turn of the
relationships of time and the picture would be different. This
readily explains the slight discrepancies found in the two

accounts. This letter is accepted by the majority of scholars as one from"the pen"of Paul.

II Thessalonians has had a much harder fight in retaining Paul's salutation. This letter has been questioned on a number of counts, one of which is the eschatalogical section 2^{1-12}. In the first letter to Thessalonians the sudden coming is imminent and will be sudden; many living in his day will see the event. In the second letter he tells the readers they must not be led to think that it is at hand. They must not think so even if a letter from him in the past led them to draw that conclusion. Here it would seem as if another were writing to correct a false impression given by Paul. It is greatly to be doubted whether anyone would dare or could substitute his letter for I Thessalonians during the life of Paul when that one could defend himself readily.

The question rests upon the harmonizing of the two accounts on the chance of Paul's changing his mind as he thought upon the problem. Peake argues that I Thessalonians looks not to immediate Parousia, although it does expect it to be in Paul's lifetime. The readers, however, took it for a sudden, immediate event. When Paul realized this view he rewrote most of the letter with special emphasis upon the Parousia and also he added fresh material in 1^{5-12}, 2^{15}, $3^{2.13-14.17}$. Thus Peake solves the problem by having II Thessalonians an explanation of I Thessalonians.

Others argue that Paul believed the Parousia to be imminent but that as time elapsed and it did not come he changed his mind and said he did not know when, but it would probably be in the lifetime of many living. There is no serious objec-

accounts. This letter is accepted by the majority of scholars as one from the pen of Paul.

II Thessalonians has had a much harder fight in retaining Paul's authorship. This letter has been questioned on a number of counts, one of which is the eschatological section 2:1-12. In the first letter to Thessalonians the author says the imminent end will be sudden; many living in his day will see the event. In the second letter he tells the readers they must not be led to think that it is at hand. They must not think so even if a letter from him in the past led them to draw that conclusion. Here it would seem as if another were writing to correct a false impression given by Paul. It is greatly to be doubted whether anyone would dare or could substitute his letter for I Thessalonians during the life of Paul when that one could defend himself readily.

The question arose upon the harmonizing of the two accounts on the change of Paul's thinking. His mind as he thought upon the problem. Some argue that I Thessalonians looks not to immediate parousia, although it does expect it to be in Paul's lifetime. The readers, however, took it for a sudden, immediate event. When Paul realizes this view he rewrote most of the letter with special emphasis upon the parousia and also he added fresh material in 1:1-12, 2:13-14,17. Thus Paul solves the problem by having II Thessalonians an explanation of I Thessalonians.

Others argue that Paul believed the parousia to be imminent but that as time elapsed and it did not come he changed his mind and said he did not know when, but it would probably be in the lifetime of many living. There is no serious objec-

tion to these two theories. A man is easily misunderstood even in the plainest of statements and men as well as women are privileged to change their minds if they find they have been mistaken. The idea that Paul was correcting a former letter accounts for the likeness between the two letters; and in the second letter it is only natural that he should add a bit for their edification. Thus whether you accept the first or second method of solution to the problem, the Pauline authorship may still be maintained as has been done by the majority of modern scholars.

The Pastoral Epistles(10) have been rejected by critics more universally than any other of the Pauline epistles. There are still many who regard their traditional authorship thoroughly spurious and easily disproved because of internal evidence. The letter can not be assigned to any known period of the Apostle's life except after his Roman imprisonment, and it is not certain that he was released. Also difficulty arises as to the instructions given Timothy and Titus since these could easily and more clearly be given by word of mouth. Because these letters have been so widely criticised, and because a proof of their genuineness would require more time and space than the material in the letters warrants for my thesis, I shall not dwell on authorship. All that is of value in these letters regarding Paul's legalism is found in the major letters, and so with a few general statements I shall conclude.

We have noted that the most valuable source of knowledge of Paul is in letters from his hand and in a biography from

(10) I & II Timothy & Titus

the hand of a companion. In regard to the Biography of Paul we have noted that Acts written by Luke, an educated man, is a source of very valuable information in giving us not only the story of Paul's life but also the general reflections of a friend and companion who was intellectually capable of understanding and appreciating Paul's mind. In the second place we have noted that the letters to the Romans, I and II Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Collossians, I Thessalonians, and II Thessalonians are all from the hand of Paul. Before drawing our conclusions we looked to tradition and saw the external criticism; then we scanned the evidence against Pauline authorship; and lastly, from the content we weighed the evidence and found that the Pauline authorship had the better and most likely argument. We did not discuss the pastoral letters since they have been very widely criticised destructively, and the length of the discussion would not be warranted by the value received from the content of the letters for our study of Paul's legalism.

II.

Paul's Training and Early Life

In regard to the training of Paul we have a fair number of statements that show quite clearly the subject matter which he studied. The training at home is, of course, the starting point. He was born at Tarsus, a large Gentile city with a Greek University. Probably near the age of thirteen he went to Jerusalem where he completed his schooling. Of his parents we know but little. The only mention of his mother is made in Galatians 1^{15}, but it gives us no information about her. His father was a Pharisee and a Roman citizen. Unlike many of the Diaspora he had retained the use of Hebrew. This may be in pride of his ancestor, Benjamin, and his position as a Pharisee. Paul had the command of both Greek and Hebrew. Because Paul was a boy in a Greek city he would naturally gain a knowldge of Greek culture (1), and have sympathy for people in the Diaspora. Paul's remark in Philippians 3^{5ff} contains most of our knowledge of Paul's early life, but this is really more than it seems, "circumcised the eighth day of the stock of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, a Hebrew of the Hebrews, as touching the law a Pharisee; as touching zeal, persecuting the church; as touching righteousness which is in the law, found blameless." Here we learn that from childhood he was brought up in strict keeping with the law, and he says that in regard to it he was blameless. Never once does he have any twinge of conscience in regard to legal imperfection either before or

(1) Gamaliel, his teacher, was a student of Greek literature (See Gamaliel, Jewish Encyclopedia)

Saul's training and early life

In regard to the training of Saul we have a fair number of statements, but these quite clearly the subject matter which he studied. The training at home is, of course, that of Saul. He was born at Tarsus, a large Hellenistic city with a great University. Probably near the age of thirteen he went to Jerusalem where he completed his schooling. Of his parents we know but little. The only mention of his mother is made in Philippians 1:3. But it gives us no information about her. His father was a Pharisee and a Roman citizen. Unlike many of the Pharisees he had retained the use of Greek. This may be in spite of his ancestor, Benjamin, who his position as a Pharisee. Saul had the command of both Greek and Hebrew. Because Saul was a boy in a Greek city he would naturally write a language of Greek culture (1), and have especially the feeling in it's idioms. Saul's training in Philippians 3:5 contains not one knowledge of Saul's early life, but this is really more than it seems. "circumcision the eighth day of the stock of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, a Hebrew of the Hebrews; touching the law a Pharisee; as touching zeal, persecuting the church; as touching righteousness which is in the law, found blameless." Here we learn that from childhood he was brought up in strict keeping with the law, and he says that in regard to it he was blameless. Never does he have any pangs of conscience in regard to legal imperfection either before or

(1) Bousset, his teacher, was a student of Greek literature (see Bousset, Jewish Religion)

after the age when he was responsible to all of the law. His life must have been rather serious and unhappy for the law was placed upon him early in life. His strange and terrific conversion, so powerful in itself, could only have come in one who had seriously and completely been placed under the law. His zeal for the law evidently came from his father, a Pharisee. No doubt he had had the amazing stories of the Messiah told him time and time again, and had been told that if even one man lived the entire law for only one day the Messianic Kingdom would be set up. In regard to the training in the school of his childhood we have one notice in Acts 22^{3b} that sends us to non-biblical sources. "Instructed according to the strict manner of the law of our fathers". This note, I believe, may be taken to refer to all of his years of training.(2) Thus we must go to a study of Jewish training for children and glean what Paul must have taken. In a late appendix to the Pirke Abod (the fourth section of the Mishnah redacted by Patriarch Judah, or ascribed to him) we learn that a boy begins in the Bible School at five years, goes to the study of Mishnah or tradition at ten, is advanced to Talmud at fifteen, marries at eighteen, etc. If Paul was instructed after the strict manner of the law, he probably underwent this course of study. In the Bible School he learned the Bible stories, the lives of his ancestors, and studied about God and the laws given by Him to Moses. Then at ten he advanced to the study of Mishnah or tradition. Here he had a great deal of memory work. This study was really but little more than just memorizing the rules

(2) Note also Acts 26^{4}

after his age when he was reason like to all of the law. He
like must have been rather serious and unhappy, for the law was
placed upon him early in life. His strength and heroic con-
vection, so powerful in itself, could only have come in one
who had seriously and deeply been placed under the law.
His zeal for the law evidently came from his father, a Pheri-
see. No doubt he had had the exciting stories of the Maccabees
told him time and time again, and had been told that if even
one can live the entire law for only one day the Messianic
Kingdom would be set up. In regard to the training in the
school of his childhood we have one notice in Acts 22[4] that
sends us to non-biblical sources. "Instructed according to the
strict manner of the law of our fathers". This note, I be-
lieve, may be taken to refer to all of his years of training.
Here we must go to a study of Jewish training for children and
given what zeal must have taken. In a late apocryphal to the Bible
book (the fourth section of the Sibylline redacted by Gutschrod
Jewish, or ascribed to him) we learn that a boy begins in the
Bible school at five years. Pass to the study of Midrash
or tradition at ten, is advanced to Talmud at fifteen, portions
of algebra, etc. If Paul was instructed after the strict
manner of the law, he probably underwent this course of study.
In the Bible school he learned the Bible stories, the lives of
his ancestors, and studies about God and the laws given by him
to Moses. Then at ten he advanced to the study of Midrash
or tradition. Here he had a great deal of memory work. This
study was really but little more than just memorizing the rules

(4) Note also note 5c.

of conduct found in the Pentateuch, and the interpretations placed on the rules by later scholars. As a Pharisee in training he would stay very close in thought to the rules of tradition. At about the age of fifteen he would be advanced to making interpretations and analyzing interpretations of biblical law.

The question arises as to when Paul went to Jerusalem. Most scholars agree that he went at about the age of thirteen. How far Paul had progressed in his education before he went to Jerusalem can only be a guess. My guess is that he had completed the memory work. We are told that "I advanced in the Jew's religion beyond many of mine own age". (3) This memory work could easily have been done at home under his father's guidance and in the synagogue school with less expense than at Jerusalem.

In Jerusalem Paul continued his legalistic training. By legalistic training I mean that he was trained as a lawyer, an interpretor of the law. The Pharisee was the student of law, and Paul was trained as a Pharisee. (4) In attempting to explain just how the training of Paul was legalistic, I must point out the legal practises in the religion of the Jews. The Bible was their religious handbook. (not our Bible but largely the material found in our Old Testament plus other traditional writings and interpretations). It was also their law book. Their political, moral, and spiritual laws had been handed directly from God. The entire rules of life were given by God, and thus all life was religious. For instance, the Mishnah, or tradition,

(3) Gal. 1[14] (4) Phil. 3[5]

of opposed views in the Talmudic, and the interpretations given to the rules by later authorities. As a Pharisee in training he would very very close in thought to the rules of tradition. At about the age of fifteen he would be advanced to master interpretations and analyzing interpretations of individual law.

The question arises as to when Saul went to Jerusalem. Most scholars agree that he went at about the age of thirteen. Now Saul had progressed in his education before he went to Jerusalem one only be a guess. By guess in that he had completed the memory work. We are told that "I advanced in the Jew's religion beyond many of mine own age." (19) This memory work could easily have been done at home under his father's guidance and in the synagogue school with less expense than at Jerusalem.

In Jerusalem Saul continues his legalistic training. By legalistic training I mean that he was trained as a lawyer, an interpretator of the law. The Pharisee was the student of law, and Saul was trained as a Pharisee. (20) In attempting to explain just how the training of Saul was legalistic, I want point out the legal practices in the religion of the Jews. The Bible was their religious handbook. Just as Bible was I regard the material found in our old testament plus other traditional writings and interpretations). It was also their law book. Their political, moral, and spiritual law has been handed directly from God. The entire rules of life were given by God, and thus all life was religious. For instance, the Sabbath, or tradition

(19) Gal. 1[14] (20) Phil. 3[5]

contained six heads. (5)

1. Zeraim --- contained laws on Agriculture
2. No'ed ---- " " " Festival Days
3. Nashim --- " " " Marriage, Divorce, Adultery, etc.
4. Nezikin -- " " " Criminal and Civil matters
5. Kodashim - " " " Sacrifice, Ritual, and Offerings
6. Toharot -- " " " Cleanliness in persons and things, and Purifications

Thus all their laws had religious sanction and all their religion was in forensic terms. When I refer then to the legalism of St. Paul, I mean the lawyer in Paul, his training as a reader and interpretor of law as a means of salvation, his legal vocabulary, and his logical method of thinking. This training began at a very early date in the home of his Pharisaic father and continued in his training at Jerusalem under Gamaliel.

When Paul went to Jerusalem he studied to become a Rabbi. His teacher was Gamaliel, a Pharisee of rather liberal views. (6) If we look a little farther into the teachings of the Pharisees (7) we will find, perhaps, an explanation for the legalism of Paul in his Christian doctrines, and be able to understand to a better degree the importance that should be placed upon that phase. This party represented the kernel of the religious hopes and aspirations of the Jewish people. (In referring to them in modern speech we would call them "Fundamentalists") They were pledged

(5) Judaism - G. F. Moore, p. 152 (6) Acts 5^{34-39}
(7) See Pharisees - Jewish Encyclopedia

contained six books. (6)

1. Jarab --- contained laws on agriculture
2. Moed ---- " " " festival days
3. Nashim --- " " marriage, divorce, military, etc.
4. Nezikin -- " " " criminal and civil matters
5. Kodashim - " " " sacrifices, ritual, and offerings
6. Tohorot -- " " " uncleanness in persons and things, and purifications

Thus all their laws and religious ceremonies and all their religion was in rabbinic terms. When I refer then to the legislation of it, that, I mean the lawyer in them, his training as a reader and interpreter of law as a means of salvation, his legal vocabulary, and his logical method of thinking. This training began at a very early age in the home of his liberalist teacher and continued in his training at Jerusalem under Gamaliel.

Then Saul went to Jerusalem he studied to become a Rabbi. His teacher was Gamaliel, a Pharisee of rather liberal views. (6) If we look a little farther into the teachings of the Pharisees (7) we will find, perhaps, an explanation for the perversion of Saul in his Christian doctrines, and be able to understand to a better degree the importance that should be placed upon that, there.

This party represented the remnant of the religious hopes and aspirations of the Jewish people. In referring to them in modern speech we would call them "fundamentalists". They were glorious

(6) Jewish - E. A. Moore, p. 182 (6) Acts 5:34-39
(7) See Pharisees - Jewish Encyclopedia

to Levitical purity to the extent of avoidance of close association with the ignorant, to the scrupulous payment of tithes, to a conscientious regard to vows and to other persons' property. The Pharisees are to be contrasted with the Sadducees, who accepted only the law but not the tradition. In their philosophy they were fundamentally democratic. Their work in the synagogue and school aimed to give to all men the law. They believed the entire law was for all men rather than just for the Priest. They represented, also, the principle of progress. This came about from their interpretations of the law. For instance, the Sadducees demanded an eye for an eye. The Pharisees said the law meant due compensation with money. They were the aristocracy and claimed that a bastard who was a student of the law was higher in rank than an ignorant high priest.(6)

The most essential doctrine of the Pharisees was the Messianic hope. They adhered to the Roman Government with the idea that what was, must be till the Kingdom of God should come. It has the idea of predestination in a social sense but retains freedom in man through a study of the law. Thus the idea of the Kingdom of God was Paul's central doctrine; he only had to interpret Jesus as the Messiah to be a true Christian. The doctrine of the resurrection of the body is also a part of the Messianic hope, and the Pharisees held this belief which was contrary to the arguments of the Sadducees. (8) The Pharisees also held the belief in the life to come, the judgment of the world with God as the judge, and future retribution for those who did not obey the ritual law of Moses. The belief in the

(8) Note discussion in Acts 23: 6-7

to levitical purity be the extent of evidence of place accordi-
ion with the ignorance, to the scrupulous judgment or [illegible], to
a catechetical regard to vows and to other personal property.
The Pharisees are to be contrasted with the Sadducees, who
accepted only the law but not the tradition. In their philoso-
phy they were fundamentally secularistic. Their work in the
synagogue was school aimed to give to all men the law. They be-
lieved the entire law was for all men rather than just for the
priest. They represented, also, the principle of progress.
This came about from their interpretations of the law. For in-
stance, the Sadducees demanded an eye for an eye. The Phari-
sees said the law meant one a compensation with money. They
were the aristocracy and claimed that a layman who was a
student of the law was higher in rank than an ignorant high
priest.(6)

The most essential doctrine of the Pharisees was the messi-
anic hope. They adhered to the Roman Government with the idea
that what was, was to be till the kingdom of God could come.
It was the idea of revolutionization in a social sense but retaining
freedom in men through a study of the law. Thus the idea of
the kingdom of God was God's central controlling; he only had to
interpret laws as the needed to be a true christian. The
doctrine of the resurrection of the body is also a part of the
messianic hope. And the Pharisees held this belief which is
contrary to the arguments of the Sadducees.(7) The Pharisees
also held the belief in the life to come, the judgment of the
world with God as the Judge, and future retribution for those
who did not obey the ritual law of Moses. The belief in the

(6) Note discussion in note XXI 6-7

future life also carried with it the belief in angels and demons. There was also the belief in redemption of the individual through the observance of the law.

Josephus [9] describes the Pharisees as being extremely virtuous and sober, and as dispensing with luxuries even to the point of asceticism. Their ethics were based on the principle of "Be holy, as the Lord your God is holy", (Lev. 19^2) This also fitted in with the teachings of Jesus, and made Paul the Jew almost a Christian. "Be ye therefore perfect as your Father who is in heaven is perfect."

Paul's teacher was Gamaliel, a grandson of Hillel, who was a very noted Jewish scholar. Gamaliel was an openminded, liberal student, and well versed in Greek literature. He appeared at the head of the legal religious body in the three letters which have come down to us, and which were dictated to his secretary. He was the originator of many legal ordinances with a view to the improvement of the world. From our knowledge of Gamaliel found in Acts [10], we are able to note his liberal character and also his high position in the Sanhedrin. There are a number of traditions concerning his friendliness toward Christianity, some even going to the extent of telling of his baptism by Peter. But most scholars, both Jewish and Christian, reject these stories, believing that he died a firm believer in the Jewish religion.

We are not to take the above doctrines and beliefs of the Pharisees given in toto as being Paul's specifically, neither

(9) History of Antiquity, see "Pharisees" (10) Acts 5^{34-36}

future life also coupled with it the belief in angels and demons. There was also the belief in redemption of the individual through the observance of the law.

Josephus [9] describes the Pharisees as being extremely virtuous and sober, and as sympathizing with luxuries even to the point of asceticism. Their ethics were based on the principle of "Be holy, as the Lord your God is holy". (Lev. 19[2]) This also fitted in with the teachings of Jesus, and made fact the law almost a Christian. "Be ye therefore perfect as your Father who is in heaven is perfect."

Hanil's teacher was Gamaliel, a grandson of Hillel, who was a very noted Jewish scholar. Gamaliel was an open-minded, liberal student, and well versed in Greek literature. He appeared at the head of the legal religious body in the three letters which have come down to us, and which were dictated to his secretary. He was the originator of many legal ordinances with a view to the improvement of the world. From our knowledge of Gamaliel found in Acts [10], we are able to note his liberal character and also his high position in the Sanhedrin. There are a number of traditions concerning his friendliness toward Christianity, some even going to the extent of telling of his baptism by Peter. But most scholars, both Jewish and Christian, reject these stories, believing that he died a firm believer in the Jewish religion.

We are not to take the above doctrines and beliefs of the Pharisees given in toto as being Hanil's specifically, neither

(9) History of Antiquity, see "Pharisees" (10) Acts 5[34-36]

are we to think that Paul swallowed all of Gamaliel's teachings without first masticating them. We know, on the contrary, that Paul was a fiery persecutor of the Christians while Gamaliel was quiet and tolerant. This shows that he was not merely a reflection of his teacher. Paul had his own ideas, and the beliefs and doctrines of his party were accepted only after they had received his stamp of individuality. Thus we must take this study of the Pharisees to show only the background and the character of the material with which he came in contact. When we note his views as set forth in his letters, then we shall be able to understand more of his training.

III

Legalism of Paul's Theology

We are attempting to analyze Paul's theology in our third chapter, and to do this we must first note his conversion. How much of Paul was converted? Certainly he could not entirely change for that would mean the eliminating of his early training and the necessitating of his being re-educated. Conversion is the recentralizing of one's life about a new focal point. This happened to Paul. The salvation he had been seeking in a legal religion was transplanted by a salvation by faith in the person of Christ as the Messiah. The Damascus experience can be and must be psychologically explained. Whether we are able to do it depends upon our knowledge rather than on the experience of Paul. Bauer in his book "Paulus", Vol. 1 p. 68, and Strauss in his "Leben Jesu", p. 33, tried to explain his conversion as a change which was gradually brought about in his mind by reflection upon the arguments presented by the Christians concerning Jesus' Messiahship, and also the moral impressions produced by Stephen. Pfleiderer in his "Paulinismus", p. 7, and Holsten in his "Die Christusvision des Paulus" in "Zum Evangelium des Paulus und des Petrius" p. 65, [1] follow Bauer but elaborate this view, making the commencement come as a slowly-developing, intellectual conviction that the Christian way of attaining righteousness was, after all, the true way. Pfleiderer points out the pharisaic expectation of the near advent of the Messiah and that this coming presupposed a righteous people which the

(1) See Steven "Pauline Theo." p. 3, footnote 3

Legalism of Kant's Theodicy

We are attempting to analyze Kant's theodicy in our third chapter, and to do this we must first note his conversion. The book of Kant was converted. Certainly he could not quickly change the idea would mean the attainment of his early training and the consecration of his being regenerated. Conversion is the recontructing of one's life around a new focal point. This happens to Kant. The salvation he had been seeking in a legal religion was transcendent by a salvation by faith in the person of Christ as the Messiah. The immense experience can be and must be psychologically explained. Whether we are able to do it depends upon our knowledge rather than on the experience of Kant. Kant in his book "Religion", Vol. I p. 68, and Sermons in his "Lehre Jesu", p. 52, tried to explain his conversion as a change which was gradually brought about in his mind by reflection upon the arguments presented by the Christians concerning Jesus' Messiahship, and also the moral impressions produced by Christ. Pfleiderer in his "Religionsphilosophie", p. 7, and Wolfen in his "Die Christusvision des Paulus" in "Zum Verständnis des Paulus und des Lutherus" p. 95, [1] follow Zeller but elaborate this view, making the commencement come as a slowly-developing, intellectual conviction that the Christian way of attaining righteousness was, after all, the true way. Pfleiderer points out the plausible explanation of the most advent of the Messiah and that this coming presupposed a righteous people which the

(1) See Steven "Paulinc Then." p. 5, Footnote 3

law could not secure. This explanation is nearer the truth, although I believe that more emphasis must be placed upon the inadequacy of the legal system in giving a spiritual passion for righteousness, in contrast to the absolute faith of the Christians whom Paul personally persecuted. Paul had not felt that the Mosaic law was giving him salvation while these Christians seemed to have that salvation which he needed.

There are two major factors which led to the conversion of Paul. The first was the life and teachings of the Christians concerning Jesus as the object of faith and as the Messiah through whom salvation was offered. The second factor grew out of the first as a contrast to it, and it was the breakdown of the law in the mind of Paul. He developed a dissatisfaction in the legal religion. It was negative rather than positive and did not satisfy his spiritual hunger. Spiritually speaking he was not able to touch the Christians whom he persecuted. Their hope, and faith, and spirituality were beyond Paul. The consolation they had was what he desired. In times of solitude he could not help but think of their religious richness in contrast to his own poverty. The psychological pigeonhole called dissatisfaction was full; it needed only one more event to make it overflow and cause the climax. The letter to Damascus, the nearness of the action as he came close to Damascus brought the climax there on the road. The backbone of the law salvation through legalism that had kept him erect, broke, and he fell on his face before the Christ seeing the light. George B. Stevens in his book "Pauline Theology" says on p. 14 "the conflict in the field on law has been found to be a hopeless one; it must be given up. A

law could not secure. This explanation is nearer the truth, although I believe that more elements must be placed upon the inadequacy of the legal system in giving a spiritual passion for righteousness. In contrast to the absolute faith of the Christians upon that personality persecuted. Paul had not felt that the Roman law was giving his activities while the Christians seemed to have that activity which he desired.

There are two major factors which led to the conversion of Paul. The first was the life and teachings of the Christians concerning Jesus as the object of faith and as the channel through which salvation was offered. The second factor grew out of the first as a contrast to it, and it was the foundation of the law in the mind of Paul. He developed a dissatisfaction in the legal religion. It was negativity rather than positive and did not satisfy his spiritual hunger. Spiritually speaking, he was not able to touch the Christians who were persecuted. Their hope, and faith, and spirituality were beyond Paul. The consolation they had was that he believes. In times of solitude he could not help but think of their religious richness in contrast to his own poverty. The psychological pigeonhole called dissatisfaction was full; it needed only one more event to make it overflow and cause the chaos. The letter to Damascus, the meanness of the action as he came close to Damascus brought the climax there on the road. The business of the law satisfied through legalism that had kept him alive, broke. He fell on his face before the Christ seeing the light. Perhaps he stumbled in his long "Christian theology" says so. If the conflict in the mind of Paul has been found to be a logical one; it must be given up.

new principle, that of faith, must supplant that of legal obedience". It does seem to me that the above quotation was the attitude of Paul. In speaking of Paul's journey to Arabia, Gal. 1[17], Dr. Burton remarks, "The revelation of Jesus as the Son of God must at once have undermined that structure of Pharisaic thought which he had hitherto accepted, and, no doubt furnished also the premises of an entirely new system of thought. To Paul the revelation of Jesus as the Son of God meant neither of these, (mere addition to Judaism of the belief that Jesus was the long expected Messiah or the acceptance of an entirely new religion with an almost total displacement of former religious views and practices) but a revolutionary revision of his former beliefs, which issued in a conception of religion which differed from the primitive Christian faith as commonly held by Jewish Christians perhaps even more than the latter differed from current Judaism." (2)

Paul at this conversion crisis made a distinction between ethical law and legalism. Ethical law he retained and fought hard to uphold, but Legalism, the idea that men are saved, gain sanctification by a careful observance of ethical and ritual law, he rejected. The letter to the church of Galatia testifies to the greatness of his exertions to retain and to promulgate this belief in the face of heavy odds. His new life was ethical law plus faith. Paul's legalism left him when he was converted.(3) He could not completely change his life; his training in his homelife and school. His God, and his entire life was shot through and through with salva-

(2) Burton - I.C.C. Galations P. 55 f.
(3) Note Paul's return to his former training in I Cor. 9:9

tion through a legal system. His conversion was the finding of something better and more satisfying than law. Paul found faith, and he found it in the person of Jesus as Christ. Where he could not find a theology in Jesus' teaching he dug it out of his past and presented it to the listening or reading Christians shot through with his new vision. (4)

There are a number of points that must be noted to show Paul's new emphasis. First, the Old Testament law was beyond question in regard to the Messiahship of Jesus. He repeatedly uses the Old Testament to prove that Jesus was the Messiah. Acts 17^{3}, 18^{28}, (Acts 9^{22}, Rom. 9^{32}) Paul's method of allegorical interpretation was very strong. He was able by means of it to use scripture in a far wider way than we are able by our historical method. If Paul could quote scripture upon a subject, for him it was beyond contradiction. Paul's conversion did not do away with his ethical use of scripture for he used it time and again as the final authority to prove his points. Just note that in Romans, the ninth chapter, he quotes from the scripture six times. Paul did not do away with the old religion, but emphasized a different element, namely, faith which God gave to the Gentiles - Romans 9^{30-33}, and to Jews - Romans 4^{1-25}. He understood the religion of the Hebrews to be the old dispensation, and when Christ came the new dispensation was set up. The old dispensation was fine as far as it went, but it did not arrive at righteousness because faith was lacking. If, then, the Jews would add to their ethical system salvation through faith in Christ as he had done, they could press on toward perfection.

Another element is in his emphasis upon the death and

(4) Note I Cor. 7:25 ff

Messiahship of Jesus. In Romans 5^{10} we find that sinful man is reconciled to God by the death of God's Son, Jesus. (Col. 1^{22}) Romans 6^{3} shows that we gain the saving element of Jesus' death by baptism into His name. The saving element in Jesus' death is that He is the Son of God, the Promised Messiah of Israel. Here we find Paul still retaining his legalistic training by making someone atone legally for sin. He has not in his technical theology been able to put aside his legal training for the higher ideal of love. The death of Christ and it's meaning was too grand and too tremendous for Paul to express in words, especially when he remembered the depth of sin in which he saw man. Paul had caught a glimpse of the ideal of love but he was not able to use it in overcoming the idea of a metaphysical punishment for sin.

Paul's legal attitude is shown in his own Christian life. He himself continued to keep the law. Acts 24^{14} says "believing all things which are according to the law, and which are written in the prophets". This statement, coming at the close of his free public life that is known to us, reveals how he lived within the law. In Acts 24^{18} they found him purified in the temple. In Acts 16^{3} Paul wished to have Timothy circumcised according to the Jewish law. In Acts 21^{19-26} we find Paul taking charge of four men who had vows. He entered into the legal system and carried it through though many have criticised Paul on this point saying that it was not consistent with his life and that he was acting a lie. This view I do not believe can be true. Paul was himself a follower of the law with the Jews. He still regarded the law as an aid to perfection for the Jews. He became all things to all men, and the law was for the Jews.

To win the Gentiles he needed to defile himself ritually, but when with the Jews, I believe, he was a true Jew. The strongest argument against Paul's legality is in his attitude to the Gentile Christians. In Acts 15 he asks that they be free from ritual law. He does not ask that they be free from moral law, as we see by his letter to the Corinthians. Paul's conception was that the law was given to Moses for Jews only since they were his chosen people. It was not meant for Gentiles. The Jews, as God's chosen people, were given the law; but it had failed to stimulate salvation through faith. The Gentiles, instead, found righteousness through faith alone. They found righteousness in a measure never before known. The pharisaic missionaries and proselyting influences of the synagogue in the Diaspora had succeeded far less than he had with his message of faith in Jesus. Paul saw that the Gentiles were willing to accept the Christian religion if only the extreme laws were removed. He came to the conclusion that the law was meant only for the Jews, and so not for the Gentiles. Therefore, why burden the Gentiles with a law that did not bring even the Jew to the feet of God? Acts 15[1] the question is of salvation without the law, and Paul has seen from experience that it has been given. In Acts 15[7ff] Peter tells the same story. The Jews still have the law as a valuable aid to faith and salvation. As time went on, the Jewish Christians became less prominent and so the element of the law was removed. But this was not until after Paul's missionary journeys. The Gentiles still have the moral law of right living but the objectionable ritual law is not

theirs to bear.[5]

The last element that we will notice here will in part recapitulate some things already said but here the subject will be dealt with from a different angle.

There are many places where Paul is inconsistent as will be seen in his theology. The cause of these inconsistencies, I believe, is to be found in the contrast between his religion and his theology. Theology tries to express the inexpressable while religion flies toward the goal without stopping to ask too many questions. Theology must answer all questions as it goes. Paul's religion and faith held a God of love, but his theology must answer the question of the debt of sin. To do this he drew upon Jesus as the Lamb of God slain for the sins of the world. (Romans 5: 6-9) From his former legalistic training this phase of his theology became colored by legalism, although in his religious attitude the universal love of God shone with clear light. Note that in Romans 5: 6-9 there is the union of love and punishment for sin. Here his religion and the problem of sin have clashed. The reach of religion is undoubtedly foremost but the idea of Christ dying to reconcile men to God has left a cloudy rather than transparent stream. Dr. Bruce remarks, "While assigning to Christ's death the double function of revealing and averting divine wrath, the apostle has in view

(5) It is interesting to note that the pharisaic mind could not help but put in the letter to the Gentiles that they abstain from polutions of idols and from fornication, and also eating of strangled meat which contained blood, and from murder. Acts 15[20]

chiefly the latter aspect. His aim is not to proclaim the fact that Christ was slain as a sacrifice, but rather to emphasize the gracious purpose for which He suffered." (6) Here is the correct union of the two antitheses and I think that Dr. Bruce would agree that Paul's conception of the death of Christ shows the two elements of divine wrath; Sacrifice for sin and the love and compassion of God toward men.

I and II Thessalonians are the earliest letters we have from Paul, and they are distinguished from the other letters by a lack of doctrinal features.(7) There is but one line dealing with the death of Christ. Here he stresses the "Grace of Christ" and the "Work of faith". These letters are the closest to the primitive apostolic teachings in their reflecting the theology of the book of Acts. Because of the lack of theology, some believe that Paul had not thought through his theology. Dr. Sheldon(7) points out that this is due rather to the fact that a primitive Christian church would not be prepared for a theology. The Judaisers had not as yet started a controversy upon these matters and so there was no need for Paul to discuss such things. There is scanty reference in any of Paul's work concerning the life and teachings of Jesus. He started with Jesus as the free gift of God sent unto all men for the justification of life. This justification is through the sacrificial death of Jesus and through his revealing the life and love of God.(8)

(6) Bruce - "St. Paul's concept. of Christianity", p. 170
(7) Sheldon - N. T. Theology, p. 172
(8) See Rom. 5: 18, II Cor. 5:21, Phil. 2: 8

strictly the latter's aspect. His aim is not to propagate the fact that a depraved man claim are a description, but rather to emphasize the truth one purpose for which he [illegible]. (6) here is the contrast within of the two antithesis and I think it is fair. Jesus would agree that Paul's conception of the death of Christ shows the two elements of divine sacrificial for sin and the love and compassion of God towards man.

Paul's theologians are the earliest letters we have from him, and they are distinguished from the other letters by a lack of doctrinal language. (7) There is not our time dealing with the death of Christ. Here he stresses the "grace of Christ" and the "act of faith". These I think are the closest to the primitive apostolic teaching in their reflection than theology at his back of [illegible]. Because of the lack of theology, some believe that Paul had not thought through his theology. Dr. Stephen(7) points out that this is due rather to the fact that a primitive Christian church would not be prepared for a theology. The apostles had not as yet started a controversy upon these matters and so there was no need for Paul to discuss such things. There is scarcity reference in any of Paul's work concerning the life and teachings of Jesus. He started with Jesus as the free gift of God sent unto all man for the final location of life. This justification is through the sacrificial death of Jesus and through his revealing the life and love of God. (8)

(6) Strong - "St. Paul's concept. of Christianity", p. 199
(7) Shelton - R. T. Theology, p. 199
(8) see Com. R: 18, II Cor. 5:21, Phil. 2: 8

Pauline theology may be divided into three parts: first, God and the world; second, man and sin; third, Christ and redemption. For convenience we shall use this system.

Dr. Sheldon remarks that Paul's conception of God may be defined as the Hebraic modified by the revelation in Christ and by personal experience. This, we shall notice is very true. Paul had his Hebraic God and his revelation of Christ. The conceptions of God presented by Christ and Paul differed to a marked degree. One was a God of love; the other was a God colored by legal restitution for sins. His own legal training bound him to the idea of having to meet legal requirements. Christ carried him to God on the wings of faith. Paul was often inconsistent. He would first argue that man's sin is atoned for by the death of Christ, and then argue that men are saved by faith. The cause of these inconsistencies is in Paul's inability to change his legal mind for the mind of Christ. Although he repudiated ritualistic legalism as a means of salvation, he still retained a God who must have full atonement for sin. This atonement was the free, loving gift of Christ to the world. His religious faith rose above this and presented a compassionate God who loved men so much that he would give even his son to suffer for the salvation of men.

Paul's theology presents a righteous God. Included in this term is God's moral sovereignty. God deals with men on an ethical basis as shown by the gospels. Divine righteousness is revealed to men through Christ in order that men, al-

Pauline theology may be divided into three parts: first, God and the world; second, man and sin; third, Christ and redemption. For convenience we shall use this system.

Dr. Shelton remarks that Paul's conversion could not be defined as the outside coming by the revelation in Christ and by personal experience. Christ, as Paul notes in very true, Saul had his security and was his justification of Christ. The conceptions of God presented by Christ and Paul differed to a marked degree. One was a God of love; the other was a God enforced by legal justification for sins. His own legal training bound him to the idea of having to meet legal requirements. Christ's relief was so low on the stage of faith. Paul was often inconsistent. He stands first er-ror that man's sin is atoned for by the death of Christ, and then argue that men are saved by faith. The cause of these inconsistencies is in Paul's inability to change his legal mind for the mind of Christ. Although he repudiates rabbi-nic legalism as a means of salvation, he still retains a God who must have full atonement for him. This atonement was the free, loving gift of Christ to the world. His religious faith rose above this and presented a compassionate God who loves man so much that he would give even his own to suffer for the salvation of man.

Paul's theology produces a righteous God. Redemption in this sense is God's moral sovereignty. God deals with man on an ethical basis as shown by the gospels. Divine righteous-ness is revealed to man through Christ in deep love and, al-

so, be inspired to become righteous. (9) God is spoken of as "Father", and in many instances the term denotes paternity, stressing the power of creating rather than the power of loving.(10) This is nearer the Old Testament conception of God than that of Jesus. This use of the term has the idea of an abstract, impersonal justice of a Supreme Ruler, but there is also the idea of the love of the Father. The former element is a theological hangover in his religion.

The anger of God (Rom. 1^{18}, 9^{17-22}, I Thess. 2^{16}, II Thess. 2^{10-12}, etc.) comes in contrast to the grace of God given through Christ. "The knowledge of God's grace in Christ deepened the apostle's senses of the imminence and terribleness of His judicial anger". (11)This again presents not Jesus' "Heavenly Father", but the Hebraic "Supreme Ruler".

The Law of God gives us a hopeful sign in Paul's worth for today. Paul can not get away from law; it is bred in him, but his religious faith sees beyond it. In Romans 3^{21-31} we have the law superseded by righteousness. The words Paul spoke about freedom are many. He tried to bring freedom to men while the law held men in bondage. It held him when he was a Jew, but he revolted in favor of faith and Christ. He fought legalism with tooth and claw when the Judaisers visited his churches and tried to make Jews of the Christians. In his own life he had found that law did not bring salvation, ethical law was necessary but legalism only showed men their sin and did not give salvation; thus for himself and his hearers he threw off

(9) II Cor. 5^{21}
(10)Rom. 6:4, 8:15, 11:28, 15:6; I Cor. 8:6, 15:24; II Cor. 1:3
(11)H. B. D. Article on Paul, p. 719

so, he longed to become a prince. (9) God is a spirit or an "energy", and in many instances the term denotes personality, exercising the power of creating rather than the power of loving.(10) This is nearer the old Indian conception of God than that of Jesus. This God or the term has the idea of an abstract, impersonal justice or a supreme ruler, but there is also the idea of the love of the father. The former element is a theological hangover in his religion.

The anger of God (Rom. 1:18, 2:17-22, 1 Thess. 2:16, 11 Thess. 2:10-12, etc.) comes in contrast to the grace of God given through Christ. "The knowledge of God's grace in Christ conquered the apostle's sense of the imminence and terrible-ness of his judicial anger". (11) This again presents not Jesus' heavenly father, but the Semitic "supreme ruler".

The law of God gives man a superior sign in Paul's mind for today. Man can not get away from law; it is true in sin, but the religious faith goes beyond it. In Romans 3:21-31 we have the law superseded by righteousness. The words Paul spoke about freedom are many. He tried to bring freedom to man while the law held man in bondage. It held him when he was a jew, but he revolted in favor of faith and Christ. He found legal-ism with Peter and also when the Judaizers visited his churches and tried to make Jews of the Christians. In his own life he had found that law did not bring salvation, ethical law was necessary but legalism only showed man their sin and did not give a justification; thus for himself and his hearers he threw off

(9) II Cor. 5:
(10) Rom. 6:4, 8:10, 11:22, 16:6; I Cor. 8:6, 12:24; II Cor. 1:3
(11) E. D. Burton on Gal. p. 719

the cloak of legalism for the arms of love and pointed men to a spiritual freedom which is our greatest heritage from Paul. His theology is poor but his reach for freedom is tremendous. The law that he could not get away from, he used to build upon: "Do we make the law of none effect through faith? God forbid; nay we establish the law." (Romans 3[31]) In the first letter to the Corinthians we have his reach beyond law to freedom. This freedom is not from law but through spiritual law. Spirituality, and faith in Christ carry one beyond legalism.

Concerning man and sin Paul is very explicit. Man is sinful; no one is without sin, "for all have sinned and fallen short of the Glory of God." Paul makes this refer to Jew and Gentile alike. Works are of no value in the face of sin, for our debt is too great to be paid for. Even Abraham was saved by faith. (12) Sin entered with Adam and thus death came into the world. All that pertains to the flesh is sinful for it is under law. The will and faith only can rise above it. The result of sin is death which reigns over all. There would have been no death had there been no sin. Lipseus in "Hand-Kommentar Zum N. T." argues that Paul thinks of sin as bringing material death without hope of resurrection. Dr. Bruce (13) does not follow this belief since he does not find collaborating material dealing with the eternal destiny of man depending on racial sin instead of personal transgression. Paul does not in any technical way present the arguments why the legal system

(12) Rom. 4: 1-3
(13) Bruce, St. P. Conception of Christianity, p. 136

the place of law, life, or the area of love and politics, was to a spiritual freedom which is our greatest heritage from God. His theology is good but his basis for freedom is erroneous. The law that he could not get rid of, he tried to build upon: "So we make the law of none effect through faith. God forbid; nay we establish the law." (Romans 3:31) In the first letter to the Corinthians we have his plea based upon love to freedom. This freedom is not from law but through spiritual law. Spirituality, as faith in Christ, carry one beyond legalism.

Concerning man the sin issue is very explicit. Man is sinful; no one is without sin. "For all have sinned and fallen short of the glory of God." Paul makes this refer to Jew and Gentile alike. Works are of no value in the issue of sin, for our debt is too great to be paid for. Even Abraham was saved by faith. (12) Sin entered with Adam and thus death came into the world. All that pertains to the flesh is subject for it is under law. The will can rule only man rise above it. The result of sin is death with which reigns over all. There would have been no death had there been no sin. Lipsius in "Rechtfertigungslehre, 1." argues that paul thinks of sin as bringing material death without hope of resurrection. Dr. Stone (13) does not follow this point since he does not find collaterial material dealing with the eternal destiny of man depending on racial sin instead of personal transgression. Paul does not in any technical way present the arguments say the legal system

(12) Rom. 4: 1-5
(13) Stone, St. J. Connection of Christianity, p. 188

does not save one, but we are able to glean three statements that help us to reformulate his theory; first, he presents the proclivity of flesh to sin; second, the law only shows one what sin is; third, our debt to God, due to our sin, is too great to be paid for by good works, and so God has given to men the free Gift of Salvation through faith.

The person of Christ is the central power in the scheme of redemption. Jesus was the revelation of God to men. "God commendeth His own love toward us, in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us".(Rom 5^8) In Gal. 4^{4-5} we find that Christ came under the law that he might redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons. In Rom. 8^3 we find that Christ came in the form of sinful flesh to show men that it was possible to walk in the spirit in spite of the flesh. The redemptive experience of Christ is the proof that to walk in the Spirit is not impossible. Thus not only the death of Christ but His life is also used to its fullest extent.

The steps of grace, or the whole drama of salvation are five in number. Perhaps it would be just as well to give the general idea of salvation before the steps are analyzed. Man is deep in sin both as a result of Adam and his own earthly lusts, and this sin is revealed by the law of Moses. God wished to save men so He sent His own Son to reveal the spiritual life which was possible and as a sacrifice, thus making full atonement for sin. (14). Man may use this saving power for

(14) See Page 31-32

does not save one, but we are able to glean from otherwise lost body an so reformulate his theory: first, we learn the probability of itself to sin; second, the law only alone one must pin it; third, not left to God, due to our sin, is for grace to be paid for a good motive, and so God has given to man the free gift of salvation through faith.

The person of Christ is the central power in the scheme of redemption. Jesus was the revelation of God to man. "God commendeth his own love toward us, in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us". (Rom 5:8) In Gal. 4:4-5 we find that Christ came under the law that he might redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons. In Rom. 8:3 we find that Christ came in the form of sinful flesh to show man that it was possible to walk in the spirit in spite of the flesh. The redemptive experience of Christ is the proof that to walk in the spirit is not impossible. Jesus not only the source of Christ but His life is also seen as the Christian ideal.

In spite of grace, or the whole scheme of salvation are five in number. Perhaps it would be just as well to give the general lines of salvation before the steps are mentioned. Man is deep in sin born as a result of Adam and his one certain lapse, and this sin is revealed by the law of Moses. God wishes to save man so he sent His own Son to reveal the spiritual life which was possible and to a sacrifice, thus making full atonement for sin. (14) Man may use his saving power for

(14) See page 31-32

himself if he has faith in Jesus Christ. Thus he arrives at salvation.

The first step in the drama of salvation is "fore-knowledge". This grows out of the omniscience of God. If God knows all he must know of man's sin and whether he will believe in the Lord Jesus Christ. The second step is "fore-ordination". It is also an outgrowth of omniscience of God and also out of His omnipotence. If God knows all, and if God made us, then He must have fore-ordained that some would be saved and others lost. The third step is "calling". (15) God wants all men to come to Him and He calls them to "come onto Me all ye that labour and are heavy laden and I will give you rest". It is God here who is taking the first step toward man. Because He loves man, and because He desires man, He calls him to Himself. He elected and chose Israel as His own people but they heeded not the call and so He turned to the Gentiles. He gave the Hebrews the law to reveal sin and hoped that they would gain their salvation through faith in God. Israel heeded not the call. God called men by the law and the prophets; when this failed He sent His Son to call men to Himself and to reveal Himself to men. Again Israel heeded not the call, but the Gentiles heard and believed.

The fourth step is that of "Justification". In II Cor. 5[19] we read "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them". These words,

(15) Note the inconsistency of logic and faith between the step of fore-ordination and calling. If Paul had realized the freedom of the will he would not have given us such a tragic theology.

himself in no way could in fact deliver. Thus he arrives at desperation.

The first step in the stream of conversion is "fore-knowledge". This grows out of the omniscience of God. If God knows all the what-know of man's sin and whether he will believe in the Lord Jesus Christ. The second step is "fore-ordination". It is also an outgrowth of omniscience of God and also out of His omnipotence. If God knows all, and if God made us, then He must have fore-ordained that some would be saved and others lost. The third step is "calling". (19) God wants all men to come to him and so calls them to "come onto Me all ye that labour and are heavy laden and I will give you rest". It is God here who is taking the first step toward man. Because He loves man, and because He desires man, He calls him to Himself. He elected and chose Israel as His own people but they rejected not the call and so He turned to the Gentiles. He gave the Hebrews the law to reveal sin and hoped that they would gain their salvation through faith in God. Israel heeded not the call. God called men by the law and the prophets; when this failed He sent His Son to call men to himself and to reveal himself to man. Again Israel heeded not the call, but the Gentiles heard and believed.

The fourth step is that of "justification". In it God is to read "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them". These words,

(19) Note the inconsistency of logic and faith towards the step of fore-ordination and calling. If God had realized the freedom of man will he would not have given us such a tragic theology.

as Bruce points out,[16] suggest a general justification of manhood on the purely objective grounds of God's satisfaction with the merits of Jesus Christ. The death of Christ as a satisfaction to God for the sins of the world does not mean that all men are justified, but rather that it is possible for them to gain justification by heeding God's call and having faith in Christ Jesus.

Justification is a forensic term which means the being accounted by God as acceptable to Him; to be approved of God, accepted as being such as God desires man to be. It carries the meaning of meeting the divine and ethical requirements under which one is placed by God. Paul's argument contrary to the Jewish legalistic system was that men are justified through faith not by legal requirements perfectly carried out. If you wish justification it may be yours by having faith in God's love and in heeding His Call through Christ. There is no progressive element in the meaning of this word, thus justification is the starting point rather than the end of life; the starting on the right road of life.

The last step in the drama of salvation is "Sanctification". Here Paul reached the pinnacle of his preaching; it was the throne of his theology, the Christ of his faith, the masterpiece of his mind. Any study of Paul is incomplete if this is left out. There is no understanding Paul's life and teachings without it; all else leads to it. Here we find legalism and theology left subordinate to the spiritual penetration of his mind and heart. Sanctification is the spiritual life. Anything that hinders is sin and death; anything that helps is the wings of

(16) Bruce "St. paul Con. of Christianity", p. 159

as "some points say,"[16] suggest a quicker justification of man-hood on the purely objective grounds of God's satisfaction with the merits of Jesus Christ. The death of Christ is a satisfaction to God for the sins of the world. Does not man in that act man are justified, but rather that it is possible for them to gain justification by trusting God's call and having faith in Christ Jesus.

Justification is a forensic term which means the being accounted by God as acceptable to Him; to be approved of God, accepted as being such as God desires man to be. It carries the meaning of meeting the divine and ethical requirements under which one is placed by God. Paul's argument contrary to the Jewish legalistic system was that men are justified through faith not by legal requirements, particularly carried out. If you wish justification it may be gained by having faith in God's love and in heeding His call through Christ. There is no progressive element in the meaning of this word. Thus justification is the starting point rather than the end of life; the starting on the right road of life.

The last step in the drama of salvation is "sanctification". Here Paul touched the pinnacle of his preaching; it was the throne of his theology, the thrust of his faith, the masterpiece of his mind. Any study of Paul is incomplete if this is left out. There is no understanding Paul's life and teachings without it; all else leads to it. Here we find legalism and theology left subordinate to the spiritual penetration of his mind and heart. Sanctification is the spiritual life. Everything that hinders is sin and death; anything that helps is the wings of

(16) Bruce "St. Paul man, or Christ-teaching", p. 149

faith. The new man is the one who has made use of all of life to build his spirit nearer to God. Sanctification is a progressive attainment, the going on towards perfection. Justification is the starting point on the new "way"; the more progress there is, the deeper the spiritual life becomes. Paul's views on marriage, divorce, eating of meats offered to idols, etc., are the social laws which he found most helpful in carrying him to the throne of God. "Faith in Christ" is the first step but one must progress and become "a new man in Christ Jesus". Sanctification involves no merit in man yet it is the right attitude and temper of the soul towards God's grace in Christ. (17) It is the doing of meritorious works, the moral and spiritual tasks, together with a faith in Christ and a passionate love of God that we gain Sanctification. The laws of religion and of life are helps on the road but they do not carry us all the way. We must have, also, the deep spiritual passion for God if we are to arrive at His throne and see His face. Thus we find the depths of meaning in Paul's life and teachings - to know God through Christ Jesus.

(17) Pauline Theology - Stevens p. 287

faith. The new man is the one who has a use for all his life to build his spiritual manner to God. Sanctification is a progressive attainment, the goal on towards perfection. Sanctification is the starting point on the new way; the more progress there is, the nearer the spiritual life becomes. God's views on marriage, divorce, setting of roots offered to people, etc., are the social laws which he terms more helpful in carrying life to the throne of God. "Faith in Christ" is the first step, and one must progress and become "a new man in Christ Jesus". Sanctification involves no merit in man yet it is the right attitude and temper of the soul towards God's grace in Christ. (IV) It is the doing of morality works, the moral and spiritual tasks, together with a faith in Christ and a passionate love of God that we gain sanctification. The laws of religion and of life are helps on the road but they do not carry us all the way. We must have, also, the deep spiritual passion for God if we are to arrive at his throne and see his face. Thus we find the heights of meaning in God's life and teachings - to know God through Christ Jesus.

(IV) Christian Theology - Stevens p. 327

IV

The Value of Paul for Modern Christianity

Before we continue farther it would be well to pause a moment to recapitulate our findings in the first three chapters. In the first chapter we noted that our sources of knowledge of Paul were of two kinds: first, his own writings retained to us in the Pauline epistles of the New Testament; second, the writings of his friends who during sections of journeys traveled with him. We noted the main objections offered by scholars to their genuineness and found the objections were not valid in the light of modern criticism.

In the second chapter we attempted to glean from the sources the life of Paul and we bore special emphasis upon the legal element of his early training. We noted that the one characteristic factor in his training was the Law. It was given to him by his pharisaic father, his Jewish teachers at home, if he had any, and by Gamaliel with whom he studied at Jerusalem. We found his training was legalistic for three reasons: first, the subject matter of Jewish education; second, Paul's later emphasis upon legalism in his theology; third, his extreme severity against those who did not follow the Law.

The third chapter endeavored to bring out the legalism in Paul's theology. His conversion was the centering of his life about Christ rather than about the Law. In doing this he kept the Law himself and in the case of Timothy had him keep the Law. In dealing explicitly with his theology

IV

The Value of Paul for Modern Christianity

Before we can know whether it would be well to pause a moment to sympathize our thinking in the light terms chapters. In the first chapter we noted that our sources of knowledge of Paul were of two kinds: first, his own writings retained by us in the reading epistles of the New Testament; second, the writings of his friends who kept sections of journeys traveled with him. We noted the main objections offered by scholars to their genuineness and found the objections were not valid in the light of modern criticism.

In the second chapter we attempted to glean from the sources the life of Paul and we bore special emphasis upon the legal elements of his early training. In moral law the one characteristic factor in his training was the law. It was given training by his Pharisaic father, his teacher at home. It he had any, one by whom with we he studied at Jerusalem. We found his training was legalistic for three reasons: first, the subject matter of Jewish education; second, Paul's later emphasis upon legalism in his theology; third, his extreme severity against those who did not follow the law.

The third chapter endeavored to bring out the legalism in Paulin theology. The conversion was the conversion of his life about christ rather than about the law. In doing this he left the law himself and in the case of Christ had also kept the law. In dealing specifically with his theology

we noted that his idea of God was primarily one of love with only a touch of the legalistic conception. He was a God who loved to the extent of giving himself for men. We noted that the element of love entered in especially when Paul forgot theology and talked of everyday life. In Paul's conception of man we found the idea of legalism very prevalent. Man was very sinful and under legal ban from God he was judged and condemned. In the theology of Redemption we noted that Paul reached beyond his legalism to a much greater degree than before. His steps of redemption are legal terms but the spirit of love and faith transcend the legal terminology. We noted that the emphasis was for freedom and the spiritualizing of life. Paul here placed ethical law as a good starting point, but he pointed out to his followers a freedom and a personal piety that is beyond the law.

It is in this freedom and in the transcendence of law that Paul's worth for present day religion must be found. The era in which we live is one that is characterized by the seeking for Freedom. The term freedom can have two meanings. For Paul it meant the transcendence of law, not the calling off of all constrictive or regulative rules, but the regulating of life to the divine will thus gaining power to achieve the ideal of life toward which all true laws point. The popular use of the term today probably implies the right to do as one pleases whether it be right or wrong. It is an ear of revolution. This battle for freedom is not a new one; it is as old as man, yet since the World War it has broken out with renewed vigor. This renewed campaign for freedom started with the war slogan, "Make

the world safe for democracy!" We thought of the World War as a "war to end war"; we were, or thought we were, fighting to free the world from the curse of war. We thought we were entirely right and the German allies all wrong, so if we could crush the German military system the cause of war would be crushed. Today we realize that we were sadly mistaken. The causes of war are deeper than militarism. The result has been the peace pacts, disarmament conferences, the League of Nations, and the World Court, all of which are attempts to bring freedom from war. This has also been carried on in an individual way. Hundreds of our college students have rebelled from military training; they have sent hundreds of letters to the Government saying that they believe war is wrong and that they refuse to bear arms in any war.

This movement for freedom is most easily recognized in the great number of political revolutions which have taken place in the last twelve years. There is hardly a section of the globe which has not witnessed such a revolt: Russia, Germany, Italy, the Balkan States, Turkey, India, China, Africa, South America, Mexico, and others. In England, France, and the Unived States the battles have been more political in nature than warlike. In these democracies the type of government is elastic enough to permit the change without the use of armed forces. Men have revolted from the bonds that have held them and the law that has hampered them, seeking the gleam of freedom. Probably the latest and most hopeful sign of freedom from the dogs of war is the attempt made to form an International Bank. The cause of war which is most prevalent is the economic. With an International

Bank there may be some hope that men will be bound so closely together in a financial way that the large money holders will not be able to disrupt the system with war.

The campaign for freedom has touched every phase of life. Women are freed from the drudgery of life by the numerous mechanical inventions, such as the electric washing machine, vacuum sweeper, etc. Men have been freed from the back-breaking drudgery of extreme manual labor. One sits on a seat and digs the ditches that a hundred men dug before. One man works a lever and loads or unloads coal, excavates cellars, and carries heavy burdens. The industrial revolution has permeated big and little businesses; it has transformed society and individuals, and, above all, it has given man a greater desire for freedom not only from work but from all confining elements.

This campaign has gone into the realm of arts and letters, and the result has been the rise of various schools of modern painting, modern poetry, modern novels, and modern dramas. The stage, the moving picture, the burlesque, the musical comedy have all felt the influence. Today the one great element in all of these is that of sex. The freedom of the modern age is staggering to the mind of yesterday. It is revolting to many, for the beauty and loveliness of sex is not always the dominant feature.

There has been a twofold revolt against modern morality. First, a revolt against having everything that pertains to sex hushed up and tabooed; men and women found that sex could be beautiful, and pure, and lovely, and they wanted to know

more about it. The result was that sex was played up and in the playing up it grew tainted and unlovely. Then came the revolt against the mussed-up morality. The demand was for clean life. There was a revolt against actors and actresses who had failed in their moral life with the result that some left the stage. The mussed-up morality has been due in part to the demand for freedom. Divorce has increased tremendously. Women have demanded freedom and one phase is sexual freedom. The public prostitute is not as common, but Judge Lindsay in his book "Companionate Marriage" points out that the man finds the satisfaction of his sexual desires with the girls he goes with instead of visiting "a house". The girl argues that she belongs to herself and has a right to do as she pleases. The trend of the general public who are looking for something better is to ask how to gain freedom from this mussed-up situation. They do not believe we are in a worse condition today than before, but they have seen things in a different light and from a different angle. They want something higher upon which they can build their lives and the lives of their children.

Another phase of the freedom of women is shown by the woman in politics. The battle of the women for the right of franchise is only a few years old;[1] and the recent political campaign, if it has proved anything, has proved that women must be reckoned with in elections. Women have taken the place of many incompetent males and have shown that they are indeed capable of carrying part of the political burdens.

(1) Woman's Suffrage - Aug. 26, 1920

more about it. The result was that her love grew cool in the playing up it grew tainted and wilovely. Then came the revolt against the mussed-up morality. The reason was for given life. There was a revolt against sulky and waterless who had failed in their moral life with the result that she left the stage. The mussed-up morality was been one in part to the demand for freedom. Divorce has increased tremendously. Women have demanded freedom and our place is sexual freedom. The public prostitute is not so common, but Judge Lindsey in his book Companionate Marriage points out that the man finds the satisfaction of his sexual desires with the girls he goes with instead of visiting a house. The girl argues that she belongs to herself and has a right to do as she pleases. The trend of the general public who are looking for something better is to ask how to gain freedom from this mussed-up situation. They do not believe we are in a worse condition today than before, but they have seen things in a darkroom light and from a different angle. They want something higher upon which they can build their lives and the lives of their children.

Another phase of the freedom of woman is shown by the woman in politics. The battle of the women for the right of franchise is only a few years old, and the recent political campaign, if it has proved anything, has proved that women must be recognized in the elections. Women have taken the place of many incompetent males and have shown that they are immense factors of carrying part of the political campaign.

(1) Women's Suffrage - Aug. 26, 1920

Not only has politics been invaded, but business as well. More women are demanding that they be free to go and do as they please. This is not only a fad of the young girl, but older women are remaining in their positions even after marriage in order that the income of the family may be increased.

The ideal of freedom is the outstanding vision of modern existence. This is true especially in the religious field.

There has been a veritable revolution in religion in the past few years. It must be noted that this revolution is more than ten years old, yet the revolution in religion is also very modern. Dr. Knudson(2) notes that there have been two great crises in the Christian religion: first, when Hebrew Christianity became platonic in thought and theology; second, when platonic Christianity became Aristotelian Christianity. The first crisis came in the day of Paul and was when Paul transplanted, by his missionary work, Hebrew Christianity to Greek soil. As an active and intelligent missionary, Paul had to meet the new challenge and situation which he in part had created. There is a distant relationship between Paul's problem and the one of today, for Christianity now is having to adjust itself to a scientific and industrial age. Today the minister must change his theology in the light of scientific research which includes research in both the facts and phenomena of religion. This is not an easy task and it entails tremendous conflicts. This has been the cause of the extreme irritation between socalled modernism and fundamentalism. The modernist has caught the new scientific spirit and applied it to his religion. The fundamentalist does not see the value of

(2) Notes in "Present Tendencies in Modern Thought", 2nd Semester, 1928-1929

such a procedure, and, although he does not always agree that the religion he has is perfect, yet he is terrified of what will happen if these new theories are accepted.

The modernist has acquired the scientific spirit which is to question all of life and, having all of the facts, to build the logical conclusions. He has said, "If this is valuable in other fields, why will it not prove equally valuable in religion?" Thus he has delved deeply into all religious actions and produced the present psychology of religion. He has interpreted every religious action in the hope of gaining a better knowledge of such action that he may produce a richer religious life. He has taken the Bible and put a question mark after every verse and tried to understand what it meant in that day and how it can be applied to our day. He has gone to every source to glean knowledge of the historical background of Biblical statements. He has tried to learn who wrote the books of the Bible and to discover their inspiration, their authority, their life, and their place in history. He has not even left Jesus alone. The fundamentalist cries, "Hold! touch not the Holy things, remove the shoes from off thy feet for you stand on Holy ground." The modernist in turn replies, "Why should I hold? My study has enriched my own religious life, and if Christ can not answer questions now he can not have much that will satisfy present-day needs." Also, Jesus did not fear to meet any questions put to him in his day, so why should we think he would fear to answer them now. This is the modernist's method of thinking and he has gone ahead and asked any question he could think of. The result has been that Jesus

stands as the greatest challenge in the life of today - as a higher ideal to be achieved. His divinity has a meaning that magnetizes the minds of men far more than ever before.

The conflict that Paul faced was one that also could be labeled the conflict of modernism vs. fundamentalism. He would have been termed a modernist. He made the Hebrew law secondary. He attempted to free men from the legalistic system that they might gain a higher conception of God and a deeper spiritual life. The conflict raged between the Jewish mind with its legalism and Greek mind with its philosophy. Between these two major elements he wound his way, leading his Christian brethren to a new spiritual life.

There was much that Paul found in the current platonic philosophy that helped him. He took (either consciously or unconsciously) the platonic idea of "real nature" and built upon it in his Christian system. "To Plato the Soul is a distinct immaterial essence of being, imprisoned, so to speak, in the body, its nature having little in common with the earthly, its home and destiny being the world of eternal ideas." (3) This same idea is Paul's for he held that the spirit had a higher existence that the earthly and that this body of sin must be put off if the spiritual life is to be given freedom. Plato held that death liberated the Soul. Paul went further and said that the earthly influences could die and permit the spirit to be free in this life.(4) Paul's idea of Perfection is similar to Plato's idealism. "Ideas are for Plato, not merely principles

(3) "Introduction to Philosophy", Patrick p. 266
(4) "Romans 6:6; Ephesians 4:22; Colossians 3:9.

of explanation; they are also standards of perfection." (5) The "real nature" of Plato includes principles of justice, goodness, beauty, etc. For Paul the real nature is the Soul, as in Platonic thought, and it includes the same principles. These must be developed to perfection and can be if we subjugate the physical life by putting off the "old man".(4) Thus Paul advances and teaches perfection in spiritual life here and now through faith in Christ. He places his Christian message in the philosophic thought of his day. This is the same type of problem which we face today; the placing of the Christian message in the scientific thought of our day.

The method and emphasis which Paul used are, in my estimation, equally valuable for today and they must be the guides to our solution of the religious problems of today. The way Paul changed his thinking will not give us much help for we are not changing to Platonic thought but to scientific thought. I have noted that today we are seeking freedom from industrial servitude, from medieval theology, from ethical restrictions, and from mussed-up morality. The dominant note of Paul's preaching was freedom from existing conditions in life in order that men would be free to accept the more spiritual adventures in faith. His legalism had failed in his own life; it had kept him from the fulness of life. He interpreted the religions of his day in the same manner. They had kept man from knowing God; therefore before they could attain the new life which he found in Christ they must be freed from their bonds. "His emancipation of Christianity proceeded upon definite lines; he was a prophet, certainly not of anarchy in religion, but of a new orientation, a re-

(5) "An Anthology of Recent Philosophy", Robinson p.
(4) Romans 6:6; Ephesians 4:22; Colossians 3:9.

page no.

ligious restatement, with a very decided setting".(6) This setting was found in his own religious experience and in the conditions of the men of his day as he saw them. Here in lies the background of his efforts for freedom.

The words of Paul concerning freedom are many. In Galatians 4^8 Paul speaks of freedom in Christ. Those who do not have spiritual insight into the free Gift of Salvation from God are still slaves, for the entire system of mundane life is theirs. For Paul, spirituality is above law for it gives to men the higher ideal of life toward which all true law points. Spirituality is gained by faith in Christ and that is freedom. (Galatians 5^{1-3}, Romans 8^2) The law came to convict of sin and thus it enslaved Paul, but Christ removed that condemnation and made men free from the law of sin and death.

In I Corinthians Paul speaks of men as slaves to this world. There is yet jealousy, and strife, and cords that bind men to the earthly existence. (I Corinthians 3^2) The only freedom that is possible must come in rising above these things. The solution to this problem or the way in which freedom will be found is in centering the life on the spiritual ideals of God's kingdom. The fruits of the spirit are given in Gal. 5^{22f}. "But the fruit of the spirit is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, meekness, selfcontrol;" To center your attention on what you wish to avoid is a sure way of bringing that thing to you. The negative code brings no relief only a positive one. This freedom is not license but it includes the living of the highest earthly life plus the spiritual life.

(6) "The Passing and Permanent in Paul", p. 225, by Bulcock

There were some in the Corinthian Church who thought of this freedom as license, but Paul points definitely to the contrary. "What then? shall we sin, because we are not under the law, but under grace? God forbid." (Romans 6^{15}) "All things are lawful for me but all things are not expedient." (Corinthians 6^{12}) "Take heed lest by any means this liberty of yours become a stumbling block to the weak." (I Corinthians 8^{9}) For many, the eating of meat offered to idols was the same as worshipping the idol. Paul points out that the idol is nothing, therefore the eating of meat is nothing; yet the weak brother may not understand this, so he, Paul, will not eat meat lest it cause another to stumble. This freedom from pagan custom is gained for all men, weak or strong, in seeking for the highest welfare for men. The above is one example of what freedom, in part, meant for Paul: it is the highest welfare for all mankind. This is what Paul meant when he said, "Love is the fulfilling of the law." (Romans 13^{10}) The end of the law is Christ, (Romans10^{4}) or spiritual life. Paul preached freedom and the only way to attain it is lifting oneself above physical, earthly life to the plane of love or spirituality. Love is the fulfilling of the law because if one is seeking to make love the center of life, then one will be in harmony with moral and physical laws. There is a freedom not from the law but in and through the law. "For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus made me free from the law of sin and death." Paul recognized that there was a spiritual law of love that was higher than mundane existence, and obedience to this law brings not only harmony in this earthly life but brings tranquility and

freedom into the spiritual forces of life as well. Paul would have called this mysticism; not a psychopathic phenomenon but an aesthetic appreciation of the spiritual, mental and physical laws of life, a feeling that one is in harmony with the divine influences in life and the satisfaction which comes through a consecration of oneself to God.

Just how does spirituality bring freedom? Someone has remarked that obedience to law is liberty. This is true in political circles. If you obey law you keep out of jail. It is true in a natural and biological sense. If you keep natural laws you remain healthy. Obedience to certain laws gives man the freedom of the air. Spirituality is superior to law for it is love of God. If you love the best and highest ideal, the lesser laws of life will be natural for they are aids to the thing you love. Thus these lesser laws no longer hinder but help you on to the thing you desire. Do you love men? Then you do not want to defraud them. Do you love God? Then you naturally desire to keep your earthly temple fit for His Presence. Law no longer binds you but it is a natural expression of the spiritual life you are seeking to live. It used to be that men thought of religion or spiritual living as being a separate department of life; a "Prince Albert" that one wore Sunday morning to church and then removed until the next week. This should not be so. It was not the life or teaching of Jesus, neither was it the mind of Paul. Today our work in social service settlements, our hospital work, our seven-day-a-week churches, and our business enterprises, all have demanded that the ideals of religion be inculcated into all of life. Religion is, in its very essence, the

relation of the living part to the living whole. "Peace with God is not and never can be a mere matter of emotional surrender, however honest and sincere. It must be an act of the whole man, feeling, thinking, and doing, in every department of his life, in obedience to a great governing and controlling principle.(7) In this spiritual control of life preached and lived by Paul, men of today must find the only freedom possible. Unless they do find it in this way the only alternative that our present system gives is death. "He that taketh the sword shall die by the sword"(8), is as true now as ever. Unless men spiritually master the tremendous powers they have created, the monster shall turn and with one fell swoop wipe from the face of the earth the man who created him. This program of gaining freedom through spiritual life has begun. We are seeking to put the study of ethics and control in our public schools. We are seeking to construct a parallel system of religious education that will supplement the industrial education. Our schools and our colleges are increasing their departments of religion, philosophy, and ethics. Our social organizations are working night and day for the building of mankind. Yet the task is hardly touched. Great social movements are fine and are of great help but primarily the change of society must come about in the individual. Each individual must accept his own responsibility finally. He must see his position in life as a member of society and he must place as the center of his desires the spiritual life. The importance of this is worldwide. My freedom is closely connected with your freedom. The degree of my freedom is determined by your freedom and vice versa. I have

(7) "Wicket Gate", p. 27 - Kennedy
(8) Mt.--26:52

now completed the circle. First I spoke of the social emphasis, then of the individual, and now I have returned to the social. This is as it should be, "No man liveth unto himself."(9) The problem of spirituality is at once both individual and social.

Thus I draw to a close this dissertation. Paul's theology was colored by legalism, but in his religious life he was able to free himself from it and place it in its proper place. Paul faced a great crisis in the growth and development of Christianity as we face it today. His solution was found to be in freedom through spirituality. We have seen that today the desire for freedom is the greatest of desires, and we have noted that Paul's answer, given 1900 years ago, is the same answer that must be given today. I have not attempted to give the arguments against freedom in a spiritual sense for, although many are given they are on an academic level upon which even the men who present them do not live. As a practical solution to the problems of our day, I have presented Paul's view of spiritual life through faith in Christ Jesus our Lord.

(9) Romans 14[7]

Summary

Because of the extensive destructive criticism of Paul and because of his historic place and influence in Christianity I have made this study, trying to find the contribution which he should make to modern thought through the element of freedom. The criticism has centered about the legalism in his theology, therefore my study has been, primarily in the interpretation of his theology to determine why it was legalistic and whether that legalism was primary.

In order to do this I first analyzed the sources for authenticity of authorship. These sources are the Acts of the Apostles and the letters of Paul to the various churches of Asia Minor and Europe. The Book of Acts was written by a companion of Paul and there was good reason to believe that the author was Luke, the author of the third Gospel. The major letters of Paul were presented and found to be from the Apostle. The criticism offered against these letters was noted and found to be unwarranted. The Pastoral Epistles were not analyzed because of the grave doubt as to authorship and the lengthy discussion would not be warranted in view of the scanty material gained.

In the second section Paul's early life was viewed. It was seen that his training was that of the Pharisee, a strict observer of the Law, from his earliest childhood to manhood. The studies that, as a Jew, he took were analyzed and they were found to be strictly legalistic. The Jewish Religion was not only their Faith but also their legal code and as a Phari-

Summary

Because of the extremely destructive criticism of text and manuscript of this literary piece was influence in arbitrarily I have made this study, hoping to find the constituents which should make it modern through through the element of treason. The criticism has centered about the legend in the text, therefore my study has been, primarily in the interpretation of the legend by the determine why it was legendistic and what the legendism was primary.

In order to do this I first analyzed the sources for authenticity or authorship. These sources are the acts of the apostles and the letters of Paul to the various churches of Asia Minor and Europe. The book of Acts was written by a contemporary of Paul and there was good reason to believe that the author was Luke, the author of the third Gospel. The major legends of Paul were researched and found to be from the apocrypha. The criticism offered against these letters was noted and found to be unwarranted. The Pastoral Epistles were not analyzed because of the grave doubt as to authorship and the lengthy discussion would not be warranted in view of the scanty material at hand.

In the second section Paul's early life was viewed. It was seen that his training was just as the Pharisee, a strict observer of the law, from his earliest childhood to manhood. The studies that, as a Jew, he took were analyzed and they were found to be strictly legalistic. The Jewish religion was not only their faith but also their legal code as a theo-

see Paul was well trained both in Religion and in the Law. The legalism of Paul came from a very thorough training in the Jewish legalistic Religion.

The third section dealt with the legalism found in Paul's theology. In order that the transition might easily be made from Paul the Jew to Paul the Christian the discussion started with the conversion experiences. In this it was noted that the entire Paul did not change. He accepted Jesus as the Messiah but still retained his former Religion. He placed Christ at the Head of Life instead of the Law. This was noted to be true for four reasons: His emphasis on the Law of Moses; his legalistic interpretation of the Messiah; the legalism in his personal life; the legalism in his theology. The discussion of theology fell into three parts. The first was God and the World. Here it was seen that he presented a Righteous God rather than a loving God. The element of Love is present but it comes out of his experience rather than from theology. The idea of anger hardly suggests the idea of Love. The second part was Man and Sin. Here it was noted that all flesh was sinful as revealed by the law. The sin of man had caused a debt to God that man could never hope to pay. Here we note the legal element of debt. The third part of the discussion on theology was, Christ and Redemption. In the five steps of redemption the note of legalism was very strong. The steps were: Foreknowledge, foreordination, calling, justification, and sanctification. These are purely legal steps by which one attains salvation, the reresults of a legally-trained mind trying to grasp by logical processes the findings of faith. It is in this faith that Paul

frees himself from his legalism and rises to the spiritual mind of Christ.

The last section presented our modern revolutions, shown in the crime wave, in the political revolts, in the freedom of woman, in arts and letters, in morality, and in religion, as an attempt to gain freedom in all phases of life. No phase of life has escaped this urge for freedom from restraint. Paul felt the same restraint in his former legalistic religion; it hampered him in his Christian theology but in his every-day life he found freedom through a spiritual understanding. Freedom came not from the law but in and through the law. It was not license but a controlling of desires through spirituality. Spirituality was the striving for the best and thus being in harmony with God's moral law. Spiritual love is the interpretation of the law.

Today our seeking of freedom must be along the same lines as Paul sought it. We can not gain freedom from industrialism except by death; we can use it and master it and thus find freedom in and through it by mental and spiritual power. The same solution must be used in freeing men from the moral problems. We are never free from but free in and through morality, using it as a stepping stone to a richer and nobler life. This spiritual life must ultimately be found through faith in Jesus as the Christ.

Bibliography

1. American Standard Bible, 1900.
2. Bacon, B. W., "An Introduction to the New Testament", Macmillen Co., 1924
3. Bruce, A. B., "St. Paul's Conception of Christianity", Charles Scribner's Sons, 1898
4. Bulcock, H., "The Passing and Permanent in St. Paul", Macmillen Co., 1926
5. Burton, E. DeWitt, "A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians", Charles Scribner's Sons, N. Y., 1920
6. Case, S. J., "Studies in Early Christianity", Century Co., N. Y., 1928
7. Conybeare, W. J. & Howson, J. S., "The Life and Epistles of St. Paul", Charles Scribner, 1858
8. Deissman, A., "St. Paul", Doubleday Doran & Co., 1912
9. Deissman, A., "Lights from the Ancient East", Hodder & Stoughton Co., N. Y., 1908
10. Deissman, A., "The Religion of Jesus and The Faith of Paul", Geo. H. Doran Co., 1923
11. Gilbert, G. H., "The Student's Life of Paul", Macmillen Co., 1923
12. Glover, T. R., "Paul of Tarsus", Geo. H. Doran Co., 1925
13. Hastings, J. "A Dictionary of the Bible", Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1898
14. Hays, D. A., "Paul and His Epistles", Methodist Book Concern, 1915
15. Headlam, "St. Paul and Christianity", Longmans, Green & Co., 1913

Bibliography

1. American Commerce Guide, 1900.

2. Bryan, G. S., "An Introduction to the Law of Contract", Macmillan Co., 1924

3. Cross, A. G., "St. Paul's Conception of Christianity", Charles Scribner's Sons, 1896

4. Gibson, D., "The Coming of Protestant in St. Paul", Macmillan Co., 1923

5. Burton, E. DeWitt, "A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians", Charles Scribner's Sons, N. Y., 1920

6. Deen, J. J., "Studies in Early Christianity", Century Co., N. Y., 1928

7. Longmaker, M. J. & Burton, J. E., "The Life and Epistles of St. Paul", Charles Scribner, 1888

8. Robertson, A., "St. Paul", Westering Gorton & Co., 1923

9. Heinecke, J., "Lights from the Ancient East", Hodder & Stoughton Co., N. Y., 1908

10. Robinson, A., "The Solution of Jesus and the Epistle of Paul", Geo. H. Doran Co., 1923

11. Gilbert, G. H., "The Student's Life of Paul", Macmillan Co., 1903

12. Glover, T. R., "Paul of Tarsus", Geo. H. Doran Co., 1924

13. Bennings, J. "A Stationery of the Bible", Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1898

14. Hope, E. J., "Paul and Jesus", Fleming Revell Company, 1913

15. Arnold, "St. Paul and Christianity", Longmans, Green & Co., 1913

16. Josephus, "Antiquity of the Jews",
J. B. Smith & Company

17. Kennedy, G. A. S., "The Wicked Gate", Doubleday Doran & Co., 1928

18. Lowstuter, W. J., "Paul, Campaigner for Christ",
Methodist Book Concern, 1915

19. Moffatt, "Introduction to the New Testament",
Charles Scribner's Sons, 1911

20. Montefiore, C. G., "Judaism and St. Paul"

21. Moore, J. F., "Judaism", Cambridge, Harvard Univ. Press, 1927

22. Peabody, F. G., "Jesus Christ and the Social Question",
Macmillen Co., 1925

23. Peake, A. S., "Critical Introduction to the New Testament",
Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1924

24. Pfleiderer, O., "Paulinismus", Leipsiz, Fues, 1873

25. Pfleiderer, O., "Hibbert Lectures",
London, Williams & Norgate, 1885

26. Ramsey, W. M., "St. Paul the Traveller and Roman Citizen",
G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1896

27. Robinson, B. W., "Life of Paul", University of Chicago Press, 1918

28. Robinson, D. S., "An Anthology of Recent Philosophy",
Thomas Y. Crowell Co., N. Y., 1929

29. Schweitzer, Albert, "Paul and His Interpreters",
London, Adams & Charles Black, 1912

30. Scott, C. A. A., "Christianity According to St. Paul",
University Press, Cambridge, Eng., 1927

31. Scott, E. F., "The First Age of Christianity",
Macmillen Co., 1926

32. Singer, I, "The Jewish Encyclopedia",
Funk & Wagnalls Co., 1901

33. Smith, D., "The Life and Letters of St. Paul",
Geo. H. Doran Co., 1920

34. Smythe, J. P., "The Story of St. Paul's Life and Letters",
J. Popt & Co., 1917

35. Weinel, H., "St. Paul, the Man and His Work",
G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1906

36. Wrede, W., "Paul", Philip Green, London, 1907

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
1 1719 02572 6250

NOT TO BE TAKEN
FROM THE LIBRARY

28-6 1/2

Ideal
Double Reversible
Manuscript Cover
PATENTED NOV. 15, 1898
Manufactured by
Adams, Cushing & Foster